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Tourism Development Revisited

An introduction

SUTHEESHNA BABU. S, SITIKANTHA MISHRA AND BIVRAJ BHUSAN PARIDA

The single term ‘development’ refers both to the destination of a journey and to the journey itself.
—G. Goulet 1968: 388

INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has welcomed the tourism industry with a mixed bag; containing shocks, uncertainties and a promising future. While contextualising, it can be seen that the industry’s shocks, which began with the Y2K bug, were sustained through political forms like the war in the Middle East and terrorism, manifested in the 11 September 2001 attack on the World Trade Center as well as the attacks in Bali, Spain, the UK and Egypt. Natural shocks include Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), bird flu, mad cow disease, the tragic tsunami, the hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico and global warming. These major political and natural elements, coupled with the impact, though mild, of the global economic system and the continuous rise in oil prices, have often thrown global tourism out of gear in the new millennium. But despite these temporary setbacks, the global tourism industry has been growing and remains as one of the leading global industries, often portrayed as a diverse mega-industry. The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO 2006) estimates bear witness to this fact. For instance, international tourist arrivals grew at 3.3 per cent annually whereas the corresponding figure for earnings from tourism was 7.1 per cent during the 2000–05 period. The sector employs 200 million people and accounts for over 10 per cent of world gross domestic product (WTTC 2004). The factors that appear to have contributed to maintaining the momentum of this growth can be summarised as: expanding global economic prosperity, strategic application of technology, evolving destination competition paradigms, product invention and re-invention, and proactive high-profile policy interventions, both collectively and by individual nations or institutions, and establishments.

However, scientific understanding about tourism, say until mid-1980s, was somewhat limited. The editorial, ‘The Anatomy of Tourism’ (1980: 7), which appeared in the special issue of the
International Social Science Journal, is summarily demonstrative of this when stating: ‘scholarly (rather than impressionistic or trade) literature on tourism remains comparatively scant and the conceptual tools brought to bear on it are still distinctly blunt.’ But, in response to the fast growth in tourism, the scholarly academic (an often contested proposition) interventions have been gaining momentum, particularly since the late 1980s, and critics have begun to strongly challenge the wisdom of many established ideological and philosophical positions on tourism. Vivid instances of this burgeoning trend could be found in the volume of writings being published in academic journals, particularly in the subjects of tourism, travel and hospitality. For instance, Hall et al. (2004) made an attempt to document the English language journals and estimated their numbers at 76; of which 29 per cent were established during 2000–04 alone and another 41 per cent during 1990–99. They further show that most of the editors of these journals happen to be based in the US, the UK, Canada or Australia.

A similar finding can be seen in the study by Weiler (2003: 91), who analysed 50 research journals in tourism to find that only 6 per cent of them were being published from developing countries. She further noted that English was the main medium of scholarly interactions and went on to state that there was little existence of communication with the non-English world. In the same way, there was scant evidence of non-English language research being documented and translated in English for wider circulation; thereby — as Nina Rao argues in this volume (Chapter 5) — limiting the substantive global understanding of this complex subject. Though the context is motivation studies in tourism, the same trend is reflective when Prentice (2004: 276) noted: ‘The non-English academic writings are hardly known at all internationally.’ Therefore, he rallies for the immediacy of creating a common research agenda and recognising the need for bottom-up studies to challenge existing paradigms or models rather than to simply accept them.

In addition to publications in core tourism titled books and journals, there have been plenty of scholarly research articles on tourism and related themes which appeared regularly in various other disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary journals/books. Some of the best early writings in tourism, like Cohen’s (1974) seminal work ‘Who is a Tourist: A conceptual clarification’ (Sociological Review), Butler’s (1980) much discussed ‘Destination Area Life Cycle Model’ (Canadian Geographer) and Nash’s (1980) ‘Tourism as an Anthropological Subject’ (Current Anthropology)—the list is just indicative—fall into this category. Interestingly, these authors did not consider the already established tourism journals like The Tourist Review (from 1956), Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly (from 1960), Journal of Leisure Research (from 1969), Journal of Travel Research (1972) or Annals of Tourism Research (from 1974) for publication of above critical writings. Again, except for some of the popular, oft-cited write-ups, the vast tourism-related knowledge presently available appears to have not received enough attention of the scholars of tourism, arguably because of their inclination to ‘look around’ for publications of tourism or related titles. A cursory glance at the references of many articles published in tourism/travel/hospitality titles, especially by young scholars, gives credence to this observation. Besides this, innumerable volumes of books,
conference/seminar proceedings and project reports published every year add to the growing body of knowledge. When put together, it amply demonstrates the importance of the subject of tourism in contemporary society.

Needless to state, a sizable portion of this burgeoning literature in tourism do addresses development theories, processes and the outcomes with a seemingly more intense focus on the negative versus positive impacts and the ‘good’ model of tourism development. The canvas of tourism development is vast because, as Pearce (1999) observed: ‘It is an expression that encompasses not only destinations, origins, motivations and impacts but also the complex linkages that exist between all the people and institutions of that interlocking, global supply and demand system.’ At the same time, as some commentators argue, development and tourism, by and large, remain separate domains with limited attempt being made to link them.

Dann (1998) identifies four reasons for the largely divorced existence of the two. First, the scholars may be disenchanted with the merger in that both tourism and development lack individual ideological neutrality. But, when considered jointly, either as state or process, they may become equally or more value laden (Wall 1997). Second, tourism development, like the domain of tourism itself, may still be at an early stage of theoretical development. Dann paraphrased Butler (1997) to state: ‘the process of development of tourist destinations has received little attention in literature … there has been large number of case studies … but they have been based on a shallow theoretical foundation.’ Third, it is not fair to criticise the policy makers alone for being insufficiently proactive towards ever-expanding tourism; instead, the theoreticians also must accept a ‘legitimate’ (author’s emphasis added) share of criticism. Fourth, while there are few cases demonstrating optimal balance between theoretical awareness and methodological sophistication, the sheer diversity of disciplinary approaches results in their proponents rarely speaking the same paradigmatic languages.

Infact, the history of tourism development bears witness to the fact that the so-called ‘theoretical weakness’ and disharmonies prevailing between the subject of tourism and that of tourism development or the dispassionate attempts to bring them closer theoretically, could not constrain the growth of tourism. Instead, tourism as a major business activity has been growing from strength to strength as a result of many processes, including socio-economic changes and technological advancements. But, what is ironical is the inadequate attempts to assess the magnitude of contribution of tourism, thereby, limiting the legitimate understanding of it in the development of national and local economies. Encouragingly enough, in recent years, scholars are engaging in more serious enquiries on the subject of tourism (the instances being contributions in journals, the collection of Lew et al. 2004 and Sharpley and Telfer 2002—the list is only indicative). Then, the paradox is that many of such engagements are yet to become truly tourism-specific, as researchers, even today, choose to identify with their respective disciplinary domains. Therefore, we may argue that a major predicament in understanding tourism as a phenomenon and an agent of development and change is perhaps the polemical argumentative, positions and a lack of willingness to move towards a convergence of perspectives. As Hawkins (1993)
suggests, there is a (greater) need to address more comprehensively a broad spectrum of tourism issues of major international (and national and sub-national) concerns that are related to various fields. Such efforts then must be directed to evolve successful development models and paradigms, capable of capturing the intricate, inexplicit relations existing in the tourism development process and between tourism and development. In other words, ‘process model’ would be more suggestive as compared to the ‘stage/state’ models.

This volume is an outcome of the realisation on the part of the authors of the need to reflect further on existing positions on tourism and development for deeper understanding. However, there is a greater realisation on our part that revisiting the eclectic and slippery (there can be many more adjectives) subject of development and its contextualisation in tourism is an arduous task. Hence, we chose to swim along with the experts on these subjects so that we learn and experience both complexity and diversity, that enable us to move closer towards convergence, thereby contributing to the ongoing process of creating tourism-specific critical knowledge. Therefore, the primary objective of this volume was to document the divergent views and paradigms on different dimensions of tourism development in order to develop convergent perspectives, so that the readers benefit from retrospecting and prospecting the themes presented. We intentionally kept the canvas of this project broad so as to ensure that it covered the laid down objectives. However, we have been very diligent and selective as far as the themes and the approach of its treatment were concerned. Then, we do acknowledge that some important themes in the discourse in tourism development such as gender, globalisation and consumption could not be included as separate chapters due to space constraints. However, several contributors to this volume have dealt with these themes, in sufficient detail, in their respective domains of discourse.

THE THEMES AND STRUCTURE OF THIS VOLUME

This volume addresses many critical themes and perspectives in tourism development through 22 meticulously selected papers. The introductory chapter, written by the editors of this book, charts the progress of tourism development and highlights how tourism has persevered despite many adversities, through a brief narration of happenings since the beginning of twenty-first century. However, existence of a mismatch can be found in relation to the growth in tourism as a business and the response of the academics, policy makers and other stakeholders. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, serious enquiries into and the large-scale documentation of the different aspects of tourism development started only in the beginning of the 1990s. So, rather than launch into a lengthy monologue on tourism development, we have made an attempt to present the diversity and depth in the relationships and processes being put forth by the contributors of this volume. These have been scrutinised and brought under five sub-thematic areas. It is hoped that the arrangement of chapters in this volume will provide a logical basis for the readers to understand some of the complex dimensions of tourism development in the twenty-first century.
Section A: Concepts, Issues and Paradigms

This sub-theme comprises five chapters dealing with the debates on subjects such as tourism disciplinarity, industrial structure, dynamics of tourism in the post-modern society and post-colonial tourism.

Sutheeshna Babu. S (Chapter 2) examines the contentious issues of disciplinary and industrial nature of tourism. His analysis acknowledges—like most previous writings on these themes—that as a discipline and an industry, the nebulousness of tourism is still to get crystallised. However, the process is gaining momentum with the progression in the scientification process being underway and more researchers choosing to come out of the ‘research funding trap’ to do critically engaged and reflexive enquiries. However, the existential dilemma of tourism as a discipline in the present form will continue because of its overly multi-disciplinary nature, whilst the management paradigm dominating its educational orientation. Therefore, he recommends the bifurcation of the body of tourism into two distinguishable as well as demarcatable discipline structures—Tourism Business Studies and Tourism Development Studies. As regards to industrial status, he argues that in a service-dominated economic development scenario, in which tourism is a major player, conventional industry definition parameters cannot be fully adopted. The existing standard industrial classification system also warrants refining so as to incorporate many newly emerged ‘industrial forms’, including the amalgated tourism industry. A supply-side approach would be better suited in such an intellectual exercise.

In Chapter 3, Richard Butler discusses modern tourism and its development in the post-modern age. After sketching out the emerging trends in international tourism, Butler argues that the tourists from East Europe and emerging economies such as India and China will remain a part of the mass package tourism industry due to economies of scale, language and other factors. With these reasons and many others identified by Sutheeshna Babu. S (Chapter 12), his position—that conventional tourist destinations will need mass tourists in the future for catering to their development-related requirements—would gain acceptability. In fact, mass tourism would continue to be the raison d’être for these and other emerging destinations. Moreover, many destinations in the traditional ‘tourism core’ (Western Europe and the US) are on the path of rejuvenation, while low-cost airlines and other industrial initiatives have become instrumental in the popularity of many other destinations. Perhaps, the most striking among Pearce’s observations would be: ‘the “new tourism” of the end of the twentieth century is likely to be seen as a minor perturbation in the long evolution of tourism.’

In Chapter 4, Peter Burns sets out a critical review of tourism and post-colonialism. While he candidly acknowledges that the domain is not an unfamiliar one in tourism, some of his concluding observations are very relevant for the understanding of the relationship between the two. He reminds us that post-colonialism is not simply an abstract concept: ‘People live post-colonial lives with their present well-being framed by multiple local and global histories.’ Therefore, a major problem in the discourse of tourism is its failure to acknowledge the fact that changes are needed in global economic structures that will enable post-colonial countries to establish a sustainable tourism portfolio that is independent of its colonial roots.
In Chapter 5, Neena Rao begins with a critique on the limitations of the technical/official definitions that posit tourism mainly as an economic activity and an attempt to bring many businesses into the ambit of tourism, even if they do not conform to the fundamental tenets of tourism. In the course of her discussion, the author highlights many cardinal issues underpinning the relationship between leisure, recreation and tourism, especially negation of the human and democratic elements, nationality considerations, West-centric narration and exclusivism. She, therefore, advocates an alternative path to approach the phenomenon of tourism that dislodges the hegemonic, business dominated paradigms to embrace multiple stakeholders, excluding tourists. She goes on to argue for a definition of tourism that will embrace more destination-/venue-specific and sustainable use of the planet, its people, cultures and their resources as the fundamental tenets. The real test of tourism then would be the ability to bridge the gap between the stakeholders and non-stakeholders. This, indeed, is a radical position since the treatment of tourism as a system has been the dominant paradigm, in which tourists are integral to the system. Even from the supply-side definition perspective, the exclusion of tourists becomes problematic because of the inseparable nature of tourism production and consumption, in which tourists themselves are an unavoidable part of production.

The last chapter in this section, jointly written by Anders Sorenson and Sutheeshna Babu. S, is an attempt to explore one of the least addressed subjects in the discourse of tourism development—the informal sector. Perhaps some notable attempts to theorise tourism informal sector dynamics could be found in the works of Kermath and Thomas (1992), Oppermann (1993) and Sorenson (2003). According to these authors, the informal sector is a characteristic of the tourism industry throughout the world, particularly in non-luxury destinations; but their conspicuous and ubiquitous presence is more typical in the developing world. Indeed, it is not a paradox to find the co-existence of the formal and informal sectors as a necessary condition in most destinations. Most often, they can be seen complementing each other while the frictions often surmount, and that leads to the formal sector drawing the dominant share of benefits. The authors also caution about the risk of ignoring backpackers because they are a huge and growing tourist segment. They then call for more serious research, both at the academic and policy levels, since a huge chunk of benefits from this segment go directly to the informal sector participants who also happen to be the socially and economically weaker section among the destination community, especially in the developing world.

Section B: Tourism Products, the Gaze and Tourism Experience

There are five chapters in this sub-theme area covering selected topics related to alternative tourism forms like rural, national parks and islands; tourist gazing; and tourism as experience platform. The selection of themes has been guided by the objective of contextualising the broader processes and paradigms of product evolution, metaphor of tourist gazing and
resultant experiences. In Chapter 7, Antonio F. Morales and María C.M. Toledano, while analysing rural tourism development in Andalucia, attempt to sketch out the spatial patterns of development and then apply bivariate densities to examine the dynamics of rural tourism supply. Other dimensions analysed include the relationship of rural tourism supply with per capita income, regional development and the importance of evolving regulatory mechanisms. The study also discusses the replicability of the major findings in the developing countries to develop rural tourism in an effective and sustainable manner.

The next chapter by Stephen Royle can be seen as an endeavour to resolve the ‘mainland’ and ‘entry’ island epistemological dilemma from a tourism perspective. While there are many studies dealing with development of tourism in islands from different perspectives (this chapter mentions some major works in island tourism), Royle approaches the subject from a geographic perspective to bring out the point that it is not the island per se which is important but the physical distance which gives them the opportunity of being positioned as ‘usual’ or ‘unusual’, ‘exotic’, ‘niche’, ‘far-off’, and so on. Island tourism takes different forms, depending on regional rather than local circumstances, and he concludes that remote islands can become important players in global tourism.

In the midst of ongoing debate on the nature, scope, extent and purpose of using common resources like protected areas for tourism, Stephen Wearing (Chapter 9) addresses the confusion and controversies surrounding tourism practices in such an environment and then builds up a theory and practice of marketing national parks, in which ecotourism plays the role of a catalyst. He develops the argument that marketing has brought an ‘alternative’ paradigm to national park management, which has made possible an increase in the breadth and depth of understanding as to how national parks need to shift their management approaches in the era of neo-liberalist economies as well as to increase the ‘view’ and identify new issues for park management. Taking the Australian experience, he argues that through appropriate and stringent strategies, an agency can market a ‘destination’ in a way that complies with organisational goals and objectives and upholds the ecotourism philosophy. However, he admits that the low-intensity, small-scale ecotourism development may be feasible only in the early phases, since the business interest and profit maximisation objectives of the industry operators will bring many contradictions in the course of development.

The other two chapters in this section address themes such as globalising tourist gaze and destinations as experience platforms. John Urry (Chapter 10), the propounder of the ‘tourist gaze’, takes a trip forward from his first encounter of the tourist gaze in 1990, and then looks back at the metamorphosis of gazing and the forces that contributed to the process. Globalisation, which was a comparably lesser force in the beginning of 1990s, has evolved into a more encompassing and engaging process, resulting in the compression of time, space and distance at a global level.

Indeed, both the virtual and corporeal travel as part of this process has become very influential and instrumental in the production and consumption of places around the globe.
It is argued, however, that there is no evidence to suggest virtual travel replacing corporeal travel; but there are complex intersections between these modes of travel experiences. These forms are also undergoing de-differentiation. Undeniably, corporeal travel has taken immense dimensions and comprises the largest ever movement of people across national borders. It could in the process see that the core components of travel industry arguably enable the participants to become the performers of contemporary global culture. He concludes that there are increasing similarities between behaviours that are ‘home’ and ‘away’, mediating to the furtherance of global gaze.

Contemporary tourism is not about just consuming. Instead, it is the revelation of intricately linked objectives of the producers and consumers (refer Sutheeshna Babu. S, Chapter 12 for more explanation), and in this play the destination emerges as a prominent ‘stage’. A major strategic paradigm of the producers of tourism is ‘experience creation’ and that is the theme Yeoryios Stamboulis intends to address in this volume (chapter 11). He argues that setting ‘experience’ at the centre of the discussion on tourism provides for a new and prolific departure for exploring important aspects of destination strategy formulation. Destinations are platforms for experience living, which brings the intangibility of tourism to the forefront—the exchange of narratives, the exploration of myths, and so on. Culture is a critical element and an integral part of the evolutionary process of the formation of destination identities and products. It acts as a regulator of the ‘co-opetitive’ game, which the stakeholders are engaged in. He concludes with the affirmation that competitive sustenance requires that ‘experience myths’ be embedded in the social realities of destinations and they cannot simply be enforced upon destinations.

Section C: Tourism Development, Sustainability and the Impacts

The major thrust here is about critically engaging with the development discourses in tourism, wherein the contributor’s attempt is to delve deeper into the emerging paradigms of tourism development. This section comprises five chapters representing varied themes: synthesis of latest development positions in tourism; international tourism in developing economies; relationship between tourism, conservation and development; informal sector tourism; case study of one of the fastest growing tourism economies (China); a new approach to the economic impact-assessment of tourism and the impacts, particularly on artisans and craftsmen.

Sutheeshna Babu. S makes an attempt to revisit the divergent development paradigms in tourism with an objective of reaching a more representative and acceptable model so as to further the growth and development of tourism (Chapter 12). He unhesitatingly acknowledges the complexity and difficulty involved in such an exercise, since the major argumentation positions—by their very nature—are diametrically opposite and the signs of ‘trade-offs’ among them appear distant. However, with the support of the existing database, he argues that abandoning some of the meaningful analytical tools such as the core–periphery model could
jeopardise the understanding of the structural patterning of global tourism business and its operations. At the same time, while existing dominant ideological positions continue to serve the purpose of understanding the philosophy that each platform stands to profess, it could be argued that each has its own set of merits. Hence the strength of each one might be used for further strengthening sustainable development. Like many scholars, for him also it is un-advisable to attach sustainability to any particular ideological position. Instead, defining it more meaningfully as a development philosophy and a way of living would be more synergic to every ideological position. In other words, even with limited commitment, all hues of ideologies might benefit by adopting sustainable development principles and practices.

Miguela Mena, in Chapter 13 on International Tourism and Developing Economies, starts with an introduction on the main motivation of countries to promote international tourism and a brief description of impacts, particularly economic. The data presented by her reveals that in many developing countries, tourism is growing very fast and is already a major component of the national economy. Incidentally, many of the countries in which tourism is important are among the poorest and least developed in the world with limited options for economic development, and therefore, tourism emerges as a vital alternative. Citing Scheyvens (2002), she argues that the critical issue of whether in the future tourism in developing countries will contribute to or undermine local development, rests on the nature of their tourism development initiatives. The strategy must include enlisting local participation, involving both control over tourism and a fair share in the benefits of tourism. But, this must be backed up by reform of the industry and its powerful players, as well as more responsible behaviour of the tourists themselves.

The convergence of tourism, conservation and development is the theme around which Sue Broad and Rochelle Spencer build Chapter 14. The authors have endeavoured upon two interesting case studies; one on volunteer tourism in Thailand and the other on NGO tour in Cuba. Armed with the findings, they seek to support the claims in the literature that ‘New Tourism’ provides opportunities that are more specialised and targeted to individual interests.

Furthermore, the participants in the above cited tours were not only influenced by motivation to seek experiences that are more authentic, educational, culturally and environmentally sustainable than mass tourism. At the same time, they also had intense desire to reflect on these characteristics. The tourists can be subject to the positive demonstration effect because their nature of experience during the tour is authentic and largely engaged, having the power to change even their lifestyles. The study testifies that tourist volunteers contribute both labour and finances to the project. The authors also recommends volunteering to those intending to work in the field of wildlife conservation. They conclude that such emerging tourism paradigms also demonstrate how these specific niches can lead to mutually beneficial relationships between conservation, development and tourism.
Chapter 15, written by Lingyun Zhang and Xiaoqiu Ma, is a critique on tourism development in China, one of the fastest growing and a major international tourism destination. The authors endeavour to examine tourism development from the perspective of new institution economics to complement the travel trade that is experiencing tremendous changes. After analysing the operational structure and functioning of the tourism industry, they argued that most integration exercises in China have failed due to the problems of high guarantee fee, non-standardised products, high entry barrier and high transaction and sunk cost, thereby limiting the capital flow and integration in the industry. However, they provide the readers with adequate indications about the changes that are underway in travel trade in China. With the opening up of the industry, the authors call for further deregulation and retreat of the government from controlling the business. Along with this, to lower the transaction cost, outdated regulations will have to be abolished. Tourism Authority should consider changing its administrative targets, functioning and working methods and also shifting its focus from inspection and audit to boost the industry development. It was concluded that to globalise China’s travel trade, establishing an internationalised economic institution and industry structure is more important than building firms of international standards. Indeed, this paper is very candid in its analysis and the readers would come away with an understanding of the paradigmatic shift in Chinese tourism development.

Dripto Mukhopadhyay traverses through a less travelled path in the subject of tourism (Chapter 16). Though many studies exist on the role of tourism in community development, one would rarely come across studies explicitly carried out to establish the relationship between these two integral processes. Through this work, Mukopadhyaya helps to reduce this gap empirically, at least to some extent, in the context of developing countries. To explore the linkages between tourism development and community development, a case examination of the artisan community in Rajasthan, India was carried out. The study found that artisan communities, particularly those operating on a small scale, were not being able to reap the benefits of tourism to a substantial extent due to various reasons like middlemen, lack of awareness, financial constraints, improper training and inadequate marketing. He, therefore, argues that a sustainable and complementary relationship between tourism and the development of the artisan community needs more pro-active policies and support from government agencies.

Section D: Analytical Techniques in Tourism

The traditional wisdom of considering tourism an important source of economic development and the measurement of the magnitude of its impacts has been a perennial source of contention in the dialogue on tourism development. Four chapters have been included in this section, each dealing with tourism-specific techniques to analyse some dimension of tourism development and processes. Larry Dwyer et al. (Chapter 17) argue that the conventional models used in assessing tourism impacts such as the multiplier and input–output techniques have
become ‘old’ or ‘obsolete’ paradigms. They are incomplete and often misleading. Therefore, they make a case for a new paradigm to analyse tourism’s economic impacts in the Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) model, which is extensively used to estimate economic impacts in various non-tourism sectors. According to them, CGE techniques represent a much more rigorous approach to estimating impacts; and as such, can be regarded as an alternative paradigm to the standard input–output techniques of assessment. The model, they argue with the assistance of case studies, recognises factor constraints, the role of exchange rate changes, and the fiscal policy settings as relevant to the impacts that changes in tourism activity have on the economy. Perhaps, CGE models can provide a more informed analysis of tourism’s economic impacts. The authors also argue that in comparison to tourism satellite accounting (TSA), CGE modelers will usually require much more detailed information than TSAs currently provide and as such, CGE model has an explicit tourism sector embedded within it. Therefore, it will be possible to generate a simulated TSA where an official TSA does not exist, as an output of the CGE model.

Though the role of tourism in regional development is a well-established fact, only few scholarly studies exist. In the same way, spatial analysis of tourism is also a subject that has not received serious attention and existing studies on this mostly are mostly in the form of micro-level case studies. The macro-level spatial study, for instance, at sub-national and national levels, is also manifestative of the regional aspects of tourism development. Chapter 18 by Sutheeshna Babu S can be seen as an attempt to bring in focus the importance of spatial analysis in the dialogue on tourism development, and also to indirectly demonstrate the regional nature of tourism. For this study, he has developed a spatial analysis technique called Index of Tourism Intensity (ITI), which is a measure of concentration that juxtaposes tourist density against resident population density. By applying ITI to the Indian context, the author comes to the conclusion that this measure is representative of tourism activities and can be used to explain macro-level spatial and regional patterns of tourism more meaningfully. This technique becomes more appropriate where the relevant data sets are inadequate, thereby, constraining higher levels of modeling and application of statistical tools, which is very much a case in tourism.

Chapter 19 deals with the use of modern technological devices, particularly Internet, in the promotion of tourism products. This chapter, jointly written by Rob Law and Catherine Cheung, approaches hotel as a product and subsequently, assesses the functionality of hotel websites in China. In this empirical exercise, authors show that there is a difference in the performance of websites of hotels in Mainland China and Hong Kong respectively, with the websites of hotels in the latter providing better ‘contact information’. They suggest improving the contents of the dimensions (viz. ‘surrounding area information’ and ‘website management’) that received low scores along with other strategies. It is necessary to re-emphasise that customers perceive all dimensions as the essential components of a comprehensive hotel website, and that a weak performance in any dimension would
adversely affect the image of the website, and as a consequence, to that of the hotel. Citing existing studies, it was also stated that some international hotel groups have been trying to regain control over online markets by way of strategies such as the introduction of lowest rate guaranteed programmes. It was suggested that given the competitive scenario, the hotels have to be more information-oriented and formulate strategies to compete internationally.

Chapter 20, by Babu George, examines a holidaymaker’s level of attachment with the whole process of holiday travel. He sets on this quantitative study with observation that the main problematic of understanding holiday-attachment lies neither in the individual components of holiday industry that constitute a holiday experience and their treatment in isolation nor in simple additive relationship that determine a tourists’ sense of satisfaction with that holiday. The author argues that the absence of an instrument to capture the effect of the holiday experience in its entirety is the main issue.

For him, the current approach of inferring the whole complex of holiday experience as the simple additive sum of the knowledge of its constituent parts is epistemologically problematic. He reasons that holidaymakers — as consumers — face numerous influences ranging from physical factors, self-image factors to socio-cultural factors, in relationship with the objects of their ‘gaze’. Therefore, the author attempts to arrive at a comprehensive measure (scale) and then makes a claim that it would be appropriate one to measure the level of attachment in consumption behaviour. For him it is more holistic and does not presume that overall holiday attachment is the additive total of attachment with the different spatio-temporal components that make up the holiday.

Section E: Changing Human Resource Practices

Some readers may wonder as to how a ‘core management’ stream such as human resources could constitute part of a book that deals with development themes. For us it is a matter of perceived notions only because the critical role of employees/workers in the development process is a well-established proposition. The aim here is to focus on some dimensions of the changing human resource practices in the tourism sector and bring the debate into the context of sustainable development dialogue. The question to be answered is whether there exist tourism-specific human resources and if yes, at what level of sophistication and responsibility so as to apply sustainable practices in tourism. It was found in the general discourse on tourism development that human resource development receives scant attention, whereas employment creation forms one of the foci of the dialogue — which indeed is very ironical. Indeed, the tourism labour market is peculiar on many accounts. This becomes very much clear in the observation of Poon (1993) that until 1990, the tourism labour market was essentially seasonal and characterised by high labour turn-over, less reputation for lower paying jobs and less flexibility. The scenario prevailing after 1990 is also not suggestive of the existence of quality human resource development strategies in the travel and tourism sector.
The editors are of the view that the detachment of human resources from tourism development debates comes at the cost of negating the understanding of development because as Baum (1995) and Smith (1994) demonstrated, tourism is a ‘peoples’ industry and employees are very much a part of tourism product. Baum (1995) argues that, because of the human element, the delivery of most tourism products and services defies standardisation and is subject to variability and iconoclastic interpretation. This provides adequate reason for the authors to include the human resource aspects in this volume on tourism development.

After careful scrutiny, two main topics have been included in this sub-theme. The chapter by Kevin Lyons endeavours to address the issue of professionalisation in tourism education against the background of the ‘unconventional’ tourism industry (Chapter 21). The main arguments stem from two angles: that of fast changes in the composition of tourism demand on the one hand and the reciprocal reaction from the industry operators and educators on the other. The thrust of the chapter is to suggest a career path for the graduates in tourism, who pass out with a lot of expectations, only to find volatile and unpredictable career options (editors’ emphasis added). He, hence, suggests that graduates develop a ‘career portfolio’, which is strategically crafted and is based on their perception of the capabilities and attributes they possess in relation to work opportunities. ‘Portfolio careerists’ seek strategic job moves and developmental experiences to compile updated profiles, which keep pace with the rapid changes in roles and job demands. The portfolio careerist is still evolving in tourism and graduates are realising more and more the unstable career path they are walking/having to walk through. However, Lyons is optimistic that as these workers develop the skills and confidence, the tourism industry will face even greater levels of turnover and mobility, and in the process they will become its most important asset.

The last chapter deals with one of the most challenging careers in tourism. Michael Christie and Peter Mason (Chapter 22) traverse the prevailing terrain of tour guiding and advocate the need for a change both in the image and the education of tourist guides. The role of guides is no longer stereotypical: taking visitors around and explaining. Guides are now expected to embrace a multiple identity: as representative of the host culture and nation; an intermediary between the host and the guest; a broker; an interpreter; a discerned companion of the ‘other’ and many more. This variously known component (guide) of the tourism market imposes its criticality on the destination industry, its people and culture through the demonstration of these identities because the end result of ‘visitor satisfaction’ has a strong bearing on the roles guides play. The authors argue that today, in comparison to the past, a new set of generic competencies is demanded of tourist guides due to processes such as globalisation of the tourist industry and revolution in information communication technology complemented by fast growth in the volume of experienced and matured tourists.

This scenario warrants trained tourist guides to be able to communicate in cross-cultural situations, be more aware of gender and equality issues and take into account ethical, environmental and other questions while executing their responsibilities. They must also have the
capacity to anticipate as well as solve problems that occur at all stages of the guided experience, for which the guides must be able to develop right thinking and act holistically. So the ‘good guides’ of today have to redefine the stereotype and adapt themselves to deal with the fast evolving complex situations that arise in the profession.

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT DIALOGUE: ARE THE GAPS NARROWING?**

Retrospectively, bearing in mind the objective with which this project was started—as previous attempts of addressing the subject of tourism development—we are perplexed at encountering the diversity and depth of the subject of tourism development. The scholars addressing the various themes in this volume itself, are a repository of the complex nature of tourism as a subject of enquiry. The perspectives, approaches, methodology and even the narrations presented here defy any attempt to straitjacket tourism as *just* a subject or *just* an industry because of the magnitude of its complexity as well as a still evolving tourism phenomenon. Tourism is a cutting-edge subject and all major disciplines continue to ‘dance around’ it but they do not allow it to develop an identity of its own because that might jeopardise their occasional sojourns in the domain of tourism. Notwithstanding, while the editors do take cognisance to some extent of the arguably kaleidoscopic nature of tourism as a subject matter, we do not subscribe to the idea of abandoning the attempts to carve out an identity for tourism studies.

Tourism is not a developed industry, but a developing one; it already contributes substantially to the economy of individual countries as well as the global economy. With all its stated limitations, there exists a strong mandate for the furtherance of attempts to sharpen and consolidate tourism-specific knowledge creation and its strengthening. As Jafari (2001) argued, the scientification process in tourism has already reached a stage where it could attempt to stand on its own while the continuance of ‘pollination’ from other disciplines will accelerate the process. Perhaps what is encouraging is the reduction in the borrowing of tools and techniques from other disciplines on one side and development of tourism-specific analytical tools on the other; which, in turn, will enable furtherance of creating critical knowledge in the subject. At the same time, what seems ironical is the ambivalence of many so-called tourism scholars, who intentionally choose to remain in the unattached but still attached mode. Having stated this, it is not to argue here that tourism is now equipped with all the required tools and techniques to document, analyse, interpret and synthesise the development problematique. Various theoretical perspectives (some of which can be found in this volume), tensions and contradictions in the field of tourism should be seen as processes from within and the efforts of the discerned scholars should be to address these with a view to further consolidate the ongoing knowledge creation endeavours. Again, the diverse argumentation traditions in tourism are to be seen as creative revisits that serve enriching knowledge and wisdom in tourism. And these need to be encouraged because as Sen (2005) argued, ‘the contemporary relevance of the dialogic traditions and of the acceptance of heterodoxy is hard to exaggerate’.
However, while ‘celebrating this diversity’ (Tribe 1997), the stakeholders in tourism cannot have the luxury of complacency because the theoretical foundations of tourism and its connectivities are yet to be solidified. The critics should not be seen as confounders, whatever be their intended motivation, but as contributors because it is the reflectivity to criticism that enables the discerned stakeholder to patch the porous areas and to consolidate and strengthen the tourism development process. The debate in sustainable tourism development has brought to light many contradictions within, such as the issues of its feasibility, theoretical weakness and internal contradictions, and it could also be seen as further contributing to strengthening its theories, principles and practices.

In the end, the question of whether the gap between the ideological positions and paradigms of tourism development is narrowing is a puzzle, because like the ‘Continental Drift’ theory, when some positions move apart, they are moving close to some others and it is a continuous process. Given this, it is very natural for the drift to cause tensions and frictions of different intensities. Therefore, we don’t intend to offer any specific conclusions or suggestions with regard to the ‘right’ development paradigm because one cannot stop the drift of thinking, and therefore, there cannot be a specific ideological paradigm for development. Rather, we stand for a development paradigm that addresses continuously the issues and concerns of all life forms and their harmonious co-existence and that may perhaps be sustainable, because it withstood the test of the past, is standing for the present and therefore, certainly for the future.
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SECTION-A
TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS,
ISSUES AND PROCESS
Tourism as Discipline and Industry

Some comments on the progressing debates

SUTHEESHNA BABU. S

INTRODUCTION

Unlike many other industry segments, the metamorphosis of tourism into a ‘globe-encircling system’ (International Social Science Journal 1980) is a recent phenomenon. The rapid growth of tourism is a result of many concomitant processes, like the fast emergence of techno-economic and socio-political orders. Characteristically, it has also become rather difficult to separate tourism from the modern life of man since it is deeply entrenched into almost every aspect of contemporary living—of the visitors and the visited. And yet, the effort towards the scientification of tourism and its analysis is relatively new as discussed in the introductory chapter, and many scholars often attribute it to its late emergence as an industry and other economic and political reasons. Interestingly, a vast body of tourism-specific literature has emerged in the late 1980s, coinciding with the fast growth in tourism business and, to a large extent, to its spread. This chapter was born out of reflections on the critical engagements of tourism scholarship in recent years about tourism’s disciplinary nature and industrial framework. The questions being addressed here are: Is the vast body of existing literature suggestive of the maturing of tourism as a discipline? If so, how far have these contributed in establishing a strong scientific foundation to understand the disciplinary and industrial characteristics of tourism? What future direction would these debates take us to? While some call tourism a discipline, some others portray it as a subject and yet for some others, it is a field of study. In the same manner, some scholars argue that tourism is an industry whereas for some others, it is not an industry at all. Still, there is small group who think that, at best, tourism qualifies to be treated as a ‘red-headed’ industry. Incidentally, these are the critical issues on which the debates continue and dialogues are, by and large, parallel.

INSTITUTIONALISED AND CONTESTED ‘TOURISM DISCIPLINE’

Retrospecting on the existing tourism knowledge base enables us to elicit two prevailing prominent positions on the issue of tourism disciplinarity. First, those who are affirmative on
this like the writings of Goeldner (1988)—cited in Hall (2004), Leiper (1981, 1990 and 2000), Page (2003), Ryan (1997), Tribe (1997) and others. Second, those who oppose the very concept of tourism as a discipline include Franklin and Crang (2001), Meethan (2001), Tribe (2005) and Weiler (2003) (list is only indicative). Why are there contentions on the disciplinarity and what logic is followed by its advocators? To begin with, it would be worth noting the reflections that characterise a discipline. According to Hirst (1974: 44), the meaning of a form of knowledge or discipline can be, ‘a distinct way in which our experience becomes structured around the use of accepted public symbols’. Further, the forms of knowledge are distinct and those are manifested in four ways. First, each form has a network of interrelated concepts. Second, these concepts form a distinctive network which gives the form its unique logical structure. Third, each form has expressions or statements which are in some way testable against experiences, using criteria which are particular to that form. And finally, they are irreducible, meaning that it is not possible to reduce these forms of knowledge any further; in other words, these are the basic building blocks. Some others who addressed the question of discipline like Toulmin (1972, 2001) through the epistemological test or Donald’s (1986) knowledge categorisation and the work of King and Brownell (1966), can be seen more in conformity with the propositions of Hirst.

Then, the central question is: Can any discipline remain distinctive and insulated from the advance in knowledge taking place around it or in other disciplines? If it can, then for how long? Epistemological and phenomenological traditions of inquiries suggest that ‘framing’ knowledge within the so-called identifiable boundaries is not suggestive because it would hamper the prospect of new knowledge creation. Here, it is worth noting the observation of Johnston (1991: 9):

> there are no fixed disciplines; nor any one correct division of academics according to subject matter. Those disciplines currently in existence are contained within boundaries established by earlier communities of scholars. The boundaries are porous so that disciplines interact. Occasionally the boundaries are changed, usually through the establishment of a new discipline that occupies an enclave within the pre-existing division of academic space....

From this angle, no discipline can claim to have an exclusive, independent existence and with the march of time, new forms of knowledge are created within existing ones, leading to forming new disciplines or ‘knowledge platforms’. The same perspective can be seen reflected in the critical scrutiny of ‘discipline’ by Becher (1989) who argued: ‘there is no single method of inquiry, no standard verification procedure, no definitive set of concepts which uniquely characterises a particular discipline’.

Substantiated Tourism Disciplinarity

Then, on what basis the call for the discipline of tourism or abandoning of any such attempt was being justified? Those scholars that favoured to treat tourism as a discipline did so on account
of tourism’s economic significance, and for educational and professional reasons. Goeldner (1988), for instance, nearly three decades ago, described: ‘tourism as a discipline in its formative stages on a parallel with business administration as it was developing in the United States.’ However, it is worth noting now that the growth—both qualitative and quantitative—in terms of scholarships as well as number of institutions and graduates of tourism in the last three decades is in no way comparable to business administration and its universal character. At the same time, there cannot be any denying that as a sectoral study area, appreciable growth and expansion have taken place to create tourism-specific knowledge during this period.

Leiper’s (1981) interest to lift tourism to the status of a discipline could be seen as an attempt to overcome the defects stemming from a fundamentally fragmented curriculum, for which, he argued, that a new discipline needs to be created to form the core strand in comprehensive programmes, especially at the professional level. He advanced a general tourism theory which embraced a system overview of tourism, in which the system constituted tourists, generating regions, transit routes, destination regions and the industry.

Later, Leiper (2000) appeared somewhat ambivalent on this issue when he stated that tourism-specific disciplines can be identified but are only a small portion of the total epistemological and heuristic resources used by scholars interested in the subject. Indeed, this observation could be viewed more similar to the manner in which the tourism industry exists and this aspect will be discussed in the next part. As Leiper stated, the important roles for specific disciplines are in education and most of the research contributions have been and will continue to come from the broader field. Ryan (2001), while critically assessing the research assessment exercise (RAE) of the UK, with special focus on tourism, concluded that the discipline base of tourism has resulted in a relatively mature body of work, with around 20 per cent of publications confirming to international quality. However, he was very critical of the quality of research in tourism in general, which is comparatively poor, lacks depth, originality and theoretical strength, and he attributes this to a large chunk of public funding going only to a few research institutions or universities. Hall (2004), though in a different context, echoes conclusions similar to that of Leiper and Ryan, that at least superficially, tourism has the characteristics of a discipline.

Even though contexts were different, many scholars (Hall et al. 2004; Leiper 2000; Tribe 2003) are of the view that tourism has to be projected and promoted as a discipline having defined limits, parameters and clear identifying characteristics. Since the early 1970s itself, tourism was being taught as a subject (Hall et al. op cit. cite the examples of the UK and Australia) and in a developing country like India, it was initially introduced as an undergraduate vocational course in the late 1970s. The first Master’s level programme in India was started in 1990, but prior to that the subject was offered at the postgraduate level as a diploma. Presently, there are many universities and colleges offering undergraduate and postgraduate degrees and diploma programmes in the subject, but primarily they are in the realm of management. Interestingly, their focus depends on the discipline offering the programme. For instance, when
it is under the arts faculty, it is termed as Master of Arts (Tourism), whereas, the management faculty conducts it as Master of Business Administration (Tourism). But, the University Grants Commission (UGC), the apex body of higher education in India, nomenclates the subject as Tourism Administration and Management which testifies the orientation in the country. It’s syllabus for the examination conducted to benchmark the eligible candidates for lectureship in higher education, firm up further the overt projection of the subject as a management stream. Then, what is ironical is, most universities in India do not adhere to the apex body guidelines for conducting tourism courses.

Interestingly, some scholars ascribing disciplinary status to tourism appear to be very cautious. For instance, Hall (2004) puts it: ‘tourism has many characteristics of a discipline—at least superficially’. Whereas, Echtner and Jamal (1997) argue that tourism fails to satisfy the eligibility as a discipline when read through the ‘prism of sociology and philosophy of knowledge’. In tune with the postmodern arguments in social sciences, the call for abandoning disciplinary boundaries to create ‘critical knowledge’ is being heard in tourism as well. For instance, following the writings of Helstrom et al. (2003), Massey (1999), Painter (2003), Sayer (1999) and Toulmin (2001) on ‘post-disciplinarity’, Coles et al. (2005: 39) argue for ‘hybrid approach’ in tourism studies. For them, it combines the progress and status accrued through more pragmatic institutional perspectives on tourism’s disciplinarity with scholarly potential and possibilities offered by post-disciplinarity. They caution that unless we move away from trenchant, dated views, to ones that recognise that tourism is mobilised fluidly beyond disciplinary boundaries, the perceptions of ‘tourism’ and ‘tourist’ are going to remain and approach that reflect earlier times; not necessarily present-day conditions. Their arguments seemingly derive strength from the nature of tourism as a subject and industry as discussed earlier, and its existence in the digitalised and globally interconnected ‘production’ (tangibles) and ‘creation’ (intangibles) environments.

Arguments against Tourism Disciplinarity

How does tourism score when tested against discipline parameters? For Tribe (1997), ‘tourism studies’ does not provide any true criteria which are particular to it but rather utilises those criteria which are found in its contributory disciplines. By adapting Hirst’s framework to analyse tourism disciplinarity, he argued that tourism studies cannot be a discipline because: first, while tourism studies can parade a number of concepts, they are hardly particular to tourism studies. Second, tourism concepts do not form a distinctive network, tend to be separate, atomised and deficient of logical linkages, do not form a cohesive theoretical framework and do not provide a distinctive, structured way of analysing the world. Third, it does not have expressions or statements which are testable against experience using criteria which are particular to tourism studies. And last, though most concepts are reducible, it is possible only through several other disciplines. Indeed, he emerges as one of the front-runners among the
critics of tourism disciplinarity, and his scholarly engagements on this subject with Leiper (2000) continue to attract serious attention of tourism fraternity the world over.

Perhaps, the disciplinarity crisis of tourism is as long as the history of critical thinking in tourism, which began somewhere is the late 1970s. One early commentator Bodewes (1981: 37) argued: ‘tourism is usually viewed as an application of established disciplines, because it does not possess sufficient doctrines to be classified as a full-fledged academic discipline.’ Even after almost two decades of Bodowes’ conclusion, critics still argue that tourism lack the theoretical underpinning which would allow it to become a discipline (see Cooper et al. 1998). Indeed, Meethan’s (2001: 2) damning observation states: ‘for all the evident expansion of journals, books and conferences specifically devoted to tourism, at a general analytical level, it remains un-theorised, eclectic and disparate’. Whereas, the attack of Franklin and Crang (2001) was directed more at the paradoxical nature of tourism knowledge creation. For, while tourism has grown very dramatically and quickly, the tourism research community is relatively new and they sarcastically stated: ‘at times, it is unclear which was growing more rapidly’. More so, tourist studies have simply tried to track and record the staggering expansion, producing enormous records of instances, case studies and variations. They attribute this to the dominance of policy and industry-sponsored research, resulting in analysis that tended to internalise industry-led priorities and perspectives—a position shared by many scholars including Tribe (1997). And, such efforts have been made by people whose disciplinary origins do not include the tools necessary to analyse and theorise the complex cultural and social processes that have been unfolded by tourism.

While commenting on tourism’s disciplinary status, Tribe (1997) has been acutely critical and advocated for even abandoning such attempts and of celebrating its diversity. He reasoned later that tourism studies themselves have no unique or distinctive ways of knowledge production; rather, it falls back on a variety of other, mainly disciplinary, approaches to provide knowledge creation rules and knowledge quality control (Tribe 2000).

There is yet another reckoning perspective on tourism research and theoretical development, grounded more in their application in ‘real world situations’. Its leading exponent Weiler (2003) sounded very skeptical of Jafari’s (1990) observation that: ‘tourism research is no longer atheoretical’. She argued: ‘theory and academic legitimacy comes at a price—alienation by industry’. For her, the exploding research outputs have increased the psychological distance and even physical distance between the research producers and its consumers, and she expressed the fear that the excess quantity may lead to a compromise in quality and it has the potential to further widen the gap between them. A similar reasoning could be found in the observation of Lynch and Brown (1999) who stated: ‘the government and business persons believe that theoretical ideas are just “excess baggages” of little value to practical realities of tourism management.’ Like other mature industries, production of research knowledge must become a part of the culture of tourism business and government agencies. Hence, Weiler (2003) argued that partnership between academia and industry requires a shift in thinking and
approach (as producers and consumers of tourism research); for partnership is an incredible ingredient for future research. The best research will be the research that is theoretically informed and stands up to replication and practical application in the ‘real world’.

However, the partnership between them may not be a bad idea if the objectives are clearly defined by each partner. But the danger lies in the overtly ‘business-like’ approach to knowledge production that has the power to circumvent the intellectual freedom of the researcher since the funding agency would like the outcome to have commercial-value or serves specific purposes. The knowledge thus produced will also have long-standing influence on the researcher and his future research plans, and he may even alter the research priorities in tune with funding considerations. Furthermore, the expansion of the critical body of knowledge in tourism could be bottlenecked since the inquiries turn more unilinear due to impartial thinking, lack of reflexivity and critical revealings.

Indeed, the conflicting propositions identified above prima facie reflect the existence of a complex web of tensions between divergent perspectives; thereby necessitating the immediacy of carving out ‘critical tourism studies’ that could possibly bring an acceptable identity to the subject. But, attempts in this direction shall begin with the acknowledgement that the critique of tourism revolves more around its ‘disciplinary character’ and unsound theoretical base. While, there are already candid acknowledgements by some scholars that ‘tourism studies is becoming institutionalised in academic terms’, which was stated as a paradox of tourism studies by some (Rojek and Urry 1997), the subject continues to suffer the wrath of critics due to the above cited predicaments. Perhaps, it is important to take cognisance of the very complex existence of tourism and its operation as an economic activity—a multi-industry, multi-product, amalgamated/aggregated/’all-in-one’ nature. Therefore, even if tourism is getting institutionalised and more organised, attributing it a generic discipline identity cannot be possible (for details see Jafari and Ritchie 1981; Meethan 2001; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Tribe 1997). While reviewing in depth the existing argumentations on these aspects goes beyond the scope of the project, some of the major theoretical propositions, as discussed above, could contribute to contextualise the ‘yet-to-mature’ identity of tourism discipline and its scientification and to place it on the counter-debate trajectory.

Perhaps, before proceeding to address the scientification arguments, it would be worthwhile to reflect on the serious scholarly engagements between Tribe and Leiper on the issue of tourism disciplinarity. Tribe in 1997, contested the arguments of Leiper (1981) by stating: ‘some 15 years after the publication of his paper, there is no evidence of such a term (turology, proposed by Leiper to denote tourism as discipline) being used’. Further, the general theory of tourism is based on the articulation of system. He then argued, Leiper’s system theory ‘hardly constitutes a unifying theory of tourism’; it is rather a useful mapping of the dimension of tourism. Leiper (2000) retorted by stating that tourism-related phenomena are too complicated, with too many implications, for knowledge to be adequately developed by specialists favouring
one discipline. To investigate the existence of a discipline, Tribe could have surveyed universities with tourism departments. Perhaps he did not do so because of his perception that: ‘there are very few departments or faculties of tourism’ (p. 644). Leiper continued: ‘Had he looked beyond his immediate environs, at universities in the United Kingdom and internationally, many examples could have been found.’ Tribe’s (2000) reply to this has been rather sharp, quick and seemingly ridiculing of Leiper’s comments as ‘unsubstantiated’. Tribe was reiterative of his earlier position (1997) and argued that crucially, given the subject of this debate, the question of tourism truths and the resolution of this dispute cannot be resolved by reference to what he (Leiper) wishes to refer to as the discipline of tourism. For, if one looked in the putative toolbox of this would-be discipline, one would find no rules or procedures that adequately helped to resolve this dispute. Though, both had resorted to making many personal remarks which were undermining in nature, what counts is the intensity of schism prevailing among the scholars endeavouring to answer the question of tourism disciplinarity.

Scientification of Tourism: How Far and How Much?

On ‘scientification’ of tourism also, there are two prominent positions: affirmative or ambivalent. Jafari’s (also happens to be the editor-in-chief of the journal *Annals of Tourism Research*) writing on scientification of tourism could be viewed as most insightful, logical as well as fundamental among the existing ones. After tracking the evolution of thought process in tourism, he delineated four distinctive positions or platforms of thinking: advocacy (the good), cautionary (the bad), adaptancy (the how) and knowledge-based (the why) (Jafari 2001). He argued that tourism has now almost all properties and tools typically associated with the more established field of investigation and is already beyond the initial steps. He states: ‘Its scientific journey is clearly in progress, aiming at new frontiers, heading to new horizons.’ Tourism is a scholarly field of study; it relates to several phenomena and utilises theories and methods of many disciplines, thereby, assuming a truly multi-disciplinary position in the academic world. And, he is optimistic that the theories and methods thus produced through scientification will be borrowed by the same disciplines that contributed generously in the formative periods. Indeed, viewing the theoretical platforms delineated by Jafari chronologically would offer a clear overview of the formation and transformation of thought process in tourism.

Though written some years prior to Jafari—while responding to Gunn (1987) and Leiper (1981) who endorsed that scientification is an important way of gaining tourism knowledge—Tribe (1997) remarked that scientific method does provide systematic check (paramount importance to science), however, only parts of the tourism phenomenon allow systematic checking. Thus, he argued, in proposing scientific method as the method of tourism analysis, one would necessarily exclude large parts of the phenomenal world of tourism which are not scientifically quantifiable and are not, indeed, scientific puzzles. In other words, the essence of
Tribe’s arguments lies in the premise that partial tourism-science provides only partial tourism knowledge. But, such contestations may be more appropriate for pure science subjects whereas in social science subjects, the laboratory-like checks cannot be carried out on many aspects of arguably the most controllable discipline such as economics.

Reading the observations of John Tribe temporally (who neither agrees nor disagrees with the scientification process), he approves the maturing process of tourism studies even if certain degree of eclecticism may be found in the arguments. For, in 1997, he concluded that the complex epistemologies associated with tourism studies result in four methods of enquiries: inter-disciplinarity, multi-disciplinarity, business inter-disciplinarity and extra-disciplinarity. It is also ‘conscious of its youthfulness’; whereas in 2005, he stated: ‘a sign of increasing maturity (in tourism) is the emergence of more reflectivity which offers a counter-balance to tourism as a business practice (authors’ emphasis added), which encourages the researchers to follow innovative and radical lines of inquiry’ (2005: 5). And, this he calls the ‘New Tourism research’.

Needless to state, it would be unrealistic to expect that maturing of a subject area happens within a span of less than a decade as reflected in the writings of Tribe, even if there was a proliferation of knowledge, theories and techniques, and their producers and consumers. It cannot simply happen since such leap-frogging will be chaotic and unsustainable. Notwithstanding, it would perhaps not be incorrect to portray that tourism is in the process of maturity, because as Hall and Page (2002) observed, the social scientific scholarship in tourism is relatively long, dating back to the Anglo-American and European tradition of the 1920s and 1930s. Then, it is also a fact that like Tribe (1997), Hall et al. (2004) and many others pointed out: ‘for a couple of decades, tourism research was overwhelmed by the burgeoning analysis of the business of tourism’. The dominance of business and policy-oriented research in tourism, indeed, would result in biased knowledge formation, thereby, constraining more comprehensive knowledge creation in tourism. However, the critical interventions by the social scientists cannot be underestimated either. So, as Jafari’s (2001) observed, like in the past, the social science will make substantial contributions in churning out critical knowledge in tourism. And in the process, would act as a major catalyst in the pursuit of scientification of tourism.

Then, should the ‘post-modern’ call for hybridisation/post-disciplinarity approach to tourism studies satisfy the thirst for creativity and innovation? Would such an approach yield to assign tourism a distinct identity and status which should be a major concern of tourism scholarship? For, initiatives like the ‘genome’, climatic change or matters of such universal dimension calling for global collaborations, cooperation, coordination and networking, it may be logical to embrace the post-disciplinarity framework. But, for a specific knowledge area like tourism, even while leaving the concern of research funding aside—a major concern of researchers notwithstanding—would the argument for universality of creating knowledge by transgressing disciplinary boundaries heed the issue of subjectivising it? It is a pertinent
question indeed and bound to be interpreted differently. But, the absence of a structure and boundaries could be perilous to the advancement of the already-existing tourism’s base knowledge. This itself make a strong case for formalised structures and boundaries to the extent of satisfying the above, even if not necessarily a rigid one.

In Need of a ‘Disciplined’ Tourism

Like many writers who have attempted to address the question of tourism discipline, this author is also perplexed to some extent; however, neither too prejudiced nor too confirmative. At the same time, due cognisance has been given to the informed view of Hall et al. (2004) that ‘the understanding of a field as complex and multi-scalar as tourism is unlikely to be the sole domain of either a single paradigm or a single domain’. It is argued here that the subject of tourism should have a ‘base identity and structure’ at the higher education level and for creation of critical knowledge base for itself. But the answer does not lie in a ‘hybrid model of tourism and hospitality education’ as proposed by Ritchie (1995) who emphasised a strong management orientation in the curriculum. The course outline proposed by Ritchie is truly multi-scalar in which every disciplinary area, cutting across environmental science, management, social science and humanities, shares a platform with tourism and hospitality, with considerable weightage given to each. However, the attempt here is not to argue whether or not such integration and overlapping of knowledge imparting is necessary in tourism education but to suggest that ultimately, it is the feasibility of implementing such an ‘umbrella curriculum’ which must draw more attention, given the time limit of a graduating programme. In fact, the general trend is that most of the undergraduate and postgraduate syllabi, by and large, remain structured in that way. Such curriculum outline encounters two major problems: first, informed experience can be used to highlight that students remain confused about opting for the ‘electives’ or ‘specialisation’ for reasons of passion for certain subjects on one hand, and on the other hand, the scope of employability with such subjects. Since higher employment and remuneration scopes are normally main considerations, non-management streams lose out in the trade-off. Second, the comprehensive multi-disciplinary structure may not motivate students who have specific interest in pursuing their education in tourism, because it might address only partially their career objectives and future plans.

Above predicaments in the tourism higher education calls for new approach and paradigms, which indeed are really challenging. A possible solution might be, as Tribe (1997) argued, bifurcation of the ‘body of tourism’ into Tourism Business Studies, and the other though he has not labelled, could be termed Tourism Development Studies. This will contribute to making an informed choice of the stream of tourism in which the potential aspirants intend to graduate rather than being drawn into ghettos of prejudiced disciplines and boundaries; which in the process could further strengthen the foundation of disciplining tourism. Needless to state, there may still be some overlapping between them, but that is unavoidable. Then, there may
be arguments that the benefits of bifurcation may go in favour of the former because of ever increasing interest in the business of tourism world over, and the latter would eventually be subjected to neglect. But in that case, the state of affairs of development studies has been like this even otherwise. The critics might argue how the same discipline can have two nomenclatures and two platforms. One way of responding would be to highlight the evolving challenges of human resource development for tourism in the fast changing socio-economic and technological scenario. Another way would be draw their attention to the happenings in the management education—from a generic discipline to specialised/custom designed/sectoral ones—all existing at the same time.

Further, while review was being carried for this study, some scholars were found expressively preferring to nomenclature as ‘Tourism Studies’ (Hall et al. 2004, Tribe 1997, and so on). However, the general trend has been to offer degrees and diplomas with management suffix to tourism/tourism and hospitality or sub-sectoral programmes such as adventure tourism. The so-called management orientation, with primary focus of ‘industry’ in the curriculum of the tourism departments/faculties is not surprising while considering the employability of such graduates (primarily industry) and also the ‘saleability’ of the course. This again makes a strong case for dividing the body of tourism knowledge as proposed. Such ‘focussing act’ in tourism studies will be more suggestive and rewarding while considering those students interested in graduating in the respective stream of tourism education as their ‘informed choice’ and pursuing a career afterwards. Perhaps, the interest of the student is a critical issue, and that seems to have been not a concern in the disciplinarity debate in tourism. Further, the syllabi of these courses make it so inter-disciplinary that many students may not even take some core modules seriously because they do not suffice their interest.

However, the above attempt need not be construed as a clarion call for disciplinary status of tourism at the research level. For, in order to create critical knowledge in any discipline, specific subject identity will and should, as Painter (2003) argued, go beyond the natural intellectual boundaries. From this angle, it would be fair to state that the call of Coles et al. (2005) for encouraging post-disciplinary enquiries with (adequate) recognition of the current structures in tourism to understand tourism’s role in the globalised world more fully, and to produce temporally relevant knowledge acquires a definite meaning. Further, symptomatic of knowledge-based platforms of thinking (Jafari 2001), scholars in recent years have been arguing to create spaces for producing the knowledge forms that encourage engagement and translatability (Ateljevic et al. 2005). Perhaps, the seminal collection of Lew et al. (2004) is an excellent illustration of the emerging plurality tradition in tourism studies, which not only bears testimony to the breadth of possible convergence/interface planes, but also the progress in critically engaged tourism research—a pointer to the emergence of what Ateljevic et al. (2005) termed as ‘New Tourism school’. These are grounded in social science theories and at the same time go beyond the industry-led or market-led priorities and perspectives.
‘INDUSTRIAL’ STRUCTURE OF TOURISM

Like its disciplinary character, the industrial nature of tourism is also contested by many for different reasons; like the perceived notion of ‘industry’, conceptual and methodological complexities, and amalgamated and at the same time, amorphous nature of it’s existence. Unlike other economic activities, scholars also attribute this to the lack of a universally accepted definition of tourism (Debbage and Ionnides 2004). Then, not surprisingly though, tourism has been referred to as one of the world’s fastest growing industries by the World Tourism Organization Business Council (WTOBC 1998) as well as one of the largest in terms of gross revenues, employment or similar economic indicators. For example, as per the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) estimates for 2003, international tourism receipts represented approximately 6 per cent of worldwide exports of goods and services (as expressed in USD) whereas in terms of service exports, share of tourism exports increased to nearly 30 per cent. It was the world’s largest export earner and an important component in the balance of payments of many countries in 2003, outstripping the exports of petroleum products, motor vehicles, telecommunications equipment, textiles or any other product or service (http://www.worldtourism.org/newsroom/campaign/benefits.pdf). The sector employs more than 200 million people (UNIS 2002, quoting Klaus Toepfer of UNEP) and the research shows that job creation in tourism is growing at one and a half times faster than any other industrial sector.

Notwithstanding, a lot of ambiguity revolves around its identity as an industry, and is called variously in differently contexts: tourism industry, travel industry, hospitality industry, and very recently, visitor industry and a combined entity as the ‘travel and tourism’ industry being accorded by World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC). But, the question that continues to remain polemical is: Does tourism as an industrial entity really exist? If so, what are the characteristics and in what form? Are these identifiable within a singular framework? There are two major perspectives on these questions. First, those set of studies argue for tourism as an industry by highlighting its salient features and the importance of according the industry status as a pre-condition to the sector’s development. Second, the platform represents the opponents of attributing industry status to tourism.

The Logic of Tourism as Industry

There can be seen two platforms proposing tourism as an industry: those that emanate from the national/international, official and industry tourism organisations such as UNWTO, country-states or industry bodies like WTTC, and the other from the academic community. The recommendations of the Ottawa International Conference on Tourism Statistics held in 1991 under the aegis of UNWTO, which were later approved by United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) in 1993, defined tourism industry as ‘the establishments providing
services and goods to visitors’ (UNWTO 1994) and by and large, the member countries adhere to this framework for statistical purposes. Whereas, WTTC (1995) embraced a broader framework by putting travel and tourism industry together and defined: ‘tourism industry together with the provision of goods and services by establishments to other non-commuting travelers, occasional local travelers etc’. But, the problems of WTTC definition lie at two levels: first, of inconsistency resulting to doubts about the characteristics and credibility of tourism as an industry. Second, it adds up to confusion and exaggeration of the magnitude of tourism impacts in the way of, as observed by Smith (1998), ‘incorporating certain shares of outputs of other industries like manufacturing and construction sectors that cannot be meaningfully claimed as tourism commodities.’

Among those in academia who favour industry status; while acknowledging tourism as not an industry of the ‘conventional sense’, also hold the view that one can still speak of ‘tourism industries’ as a core concept. It could denote to those industry segment(s) producing a tourism commodity (Smith 2004) and those visitors consuming them in the course as tourist experience (that is, consumption). Accordingly, he defined ‘tourism industries’ as: ‘those industries designed by a nation’s standard industrial classification system that would either cease to exist or would exist in a substantially reduced form in the absence of tourism’ (Smith 1998, p. 38). He then argued, tourism industry may be a ‘synthetic’, a ‘matrix’ or a ‘composite’ but still is an industry. In the absence of tourism, this industry would diminish or even disappear. Medlik (1996: 252) made a stronger case and defined: ‘tourism industry comprises firms and establishments providing attractions, facilities and service for the tourists’. The definition by Gee et al. (1997: 4) followed a similar course and positioned tourism as a collection of businesses selling travel-related services. In reality, the individual segments within the tourism industry do not act as an integrated group and, very often, have conflicting interests among themselves. According to them, tourism has many similarities with the retail industry in such a manner where there are many segments involved directly or indirectly in providing travel-related services.

Needless to state, already, the complexity and diversity of tourism industry are well acknowledged globally and as a production system, it involves manufacturing, services and many other intangible non-market inputs, though the latter have not been accounted for in the existing classification system. For instance, UNWTO (1998) identifies seven industrial categories based on ‘tourism consumption by major function’ whereas the US Standard Industrial Classification System records more than 35 different major industrial components that serve the traveler (Roehl 1998). It is also very typical to tourism industry that its structure is fragmented and dominated by a large number of very small operators. Owing much to this, the industry is — not surprising either — very fragile, and sustains one of highest failure rates compared to any sector (WTOBC Report 1998). The report also reveals that there are approximately 40 types of taxes being applied to tourism globally, though their numbers vary across countries, further magnifying the complexity and fragmentation characteristics. But what cannot be challenged is that despite the individual stature of the major components of tourism such
as transportation, accommodation, attraction or other related services, there is still a strong functional ‘umbilical cord’ that interconnects them in the form of essential requirements of those temporally away from their ‘usual home’ environment. In the absence of a common code, individually each sector has only marginal existence, which in other words, strengthens the case further for industrial status of tourism.

The pro-industry debates are also demonstrative of strong disagreements on whether to embark on the demand-side or supply-side approach. Often, adoption of a demand-side approach, which is undoubtedly most common, has been suggested as a major reason for compounding the confusion of tourism’s industry status (Smith 1988). Hence, arguments have been advanced—most of them happen to be geographers’—for a supply-side definition as fundamental to any consideration of tourism as an industry (Britton 1991; Debbage and Ioannides 2004; Ioannides 1995; Smith 1988, 1993, 1994 and 1998). They argued that this would enable to define tourism in terms of a homogenous product and single production process. The supply-side definitions essentially portray tourism production system as representing a mix of businesses and other business organisations that provide tourism services.

According to Smith (1994), a generic tourism product could be hypothesised as a layered one—the physical product in the centre and then the service, hospitality, freedom of choice and finally, involvement at the periphery. All these attributes should be present for a satisfactory tourist experience, even though their relative importance would vary depending on the specific tourist experience. The production of tourism product involves four stages. It begins with primary inputs or resources which are then transformed into intermediate inputs such as physical facilities, and further processed through additional inputs of labour and management to create intermediate outputs at the third stage. In the final stage, which is the distinguishing feature of tourism industry, visitor takes the intermediate outputs and processes them into final output as experience. Hence, Smith (1998: 51) argued that the consumer is an integral part of the production of tourism products that churn out the final product, that is, ‘the experience’. However, this mix need not be static; for it can change over time and as Britton (1991) observed, the process is likely to be affected by a restructuring of the broader economy. Roehl (1998), while analysing tourism industry using Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) of the US, stated that SIC could not identify many economic activities that were part of tourism production system.

The production and consumption in tourism are also very typical paradigms in that, as Urry (1990) portrayed, their ‘spatial fixity’ characteristic makes not only the production and consumption to take place simultaneously at the place of production; it also, in effect, partly involves the ‘place’. The tourist consumer has to reach the place of production (that is, destination) for consumption to take place. The tourist consumption endowments, which are nothing but supply in tourism, constitute the inherent and purpose-built place attributes (accommodation, transport, attraction, entertainments, and so on), and in the absence of these, destination ceases to exist. In addition, destinations have to keep re-inventing themselves in order to remain successful and competitive because for most tourists, visiting places are integral to their quest for
personal intrinsic benefits. In the light of the above views, adopting a supply-side approach to defining tourism industry acquires more meaning for development planning and management of tourism and the impacts.

Tourism Industry is Red-headed?

The opponents of portraying tourism as industry appear to embrace the tradition of defining it the way the term was defined in the golden era of manufacturing, of which prominent are Davidson (2001), Leiper (1990), and Tucker and Sundberg (1988). After citing conventional wisdom of defining an industry, Leiper (1990: 22) argued that tourism is not an industry at all; at best, it is a collection of industries. He reasoned further that tourism is a social phenomenon, an experience or a process, not a production activity. As an economic force, it is expenditure-driven and not receipt-driven, and therefore, it is incorrect to call it an industry as ‘it demeans what tourism really is’. There are also negative implications, like ‘the disbelief’ of the traditional understanding of industry, methods of measurement and analysis, and disadvantage for such public funding. Hence, one needs to ‘think outside the box’ to truly understand, measure, analyse and market tourism. Then, it is ironical that Leiper, on one hand argues that tourism is not an industry and on the other hand, emerges as a strong proponent of tourism discipline. Interestingly, major critics and criticisms in both contexts are directed to definitional parameters. Hence, when Leiper agrees that tourism qualifies to become a discipline, is he not contradicting himself in the case of its industrial status? The conventional wisdom allows one to argue that without a characteristic definition, and tools and techniques of the subject (here it is tourism), it cannot be termed as a discipline, and in the absence of a disciplinary framework it cannot exist as an industry.

Tucker and Sundberg (1988: 145) were equally critical when they wrote: ‘tourism is not an industry in the conventional sense as there is no single production process, no homogenous product, and no locationally confined market’. In other words, when viewed from the planning and policy perspective, does it imply that there is no need for policy interventions or analysis of tourism as an important socio-economic phenomenon? Leiper (1990: 603) was also seen to lean more towards this view and noted that such attempts invite the risk of reducing tourism to a ‘red-head industry’ — it can at best be ‘partially-industrialised’. Urry’s (1990) postulation of ‘tourism gaze’ also places tourism beyond conventional realm of industry and argues that the production and consumption of tourist experiences are the products of contextualised social relations. Perhaps, the anti-industry arguments add credence to the fact that tourism industry cannot be tenable with conventional definitions of industry, which may be the reason for Debbage and Daniels (1998) to point out that actual purchase of production/consumption of tourism services like transport, accommodation, and so on, may be ‘incidental’ to non-market activities like sightseeing, sunbathing or the like, and all of them are intangible parts.

Further, how may one react to Davidson (2001), a major critic, when he asks: ‘why raise the issue (of industrial status of tourism) at all?’ Perhaps, raising these issues, debating them and
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then attempting to arrive at a convergence of perspectives—which is a continuous process—are integral to the tourism development process. One way of looking at ‘industrial tourism’ is to elicit the nature and form of ‘tour package industry’ offerings, that is, the package tours. In this case, the production process begins when the customer reaches out to the tour operator and, based on the requirements, the tour operator finalises accommodation, transport, food and other services, subsequently negotiating and finalising with the providers of these, and finally developing the tour packages. However, the process differs in the case of ready-made tour packages. But, irrespective of ready-made or tailor-made tour packages, they satisfy the qualities of a generic product. Since the tour operator is central to the production process, he most often performs the role of a wholesaler, distributor and direct seller. Viewed from the definition of industry, the whole mechanism satisfies most definitional parameters. But then, this author does take cognisance that this segment constitutes only a portion of the tourism business spectrum. Perhaps, a more encompassing and representative approach may be, as Smith (2004) argued, after an exhaustive review, the adoption of more fine-tuned tourism satellite accounts (TSA) to suit specific contexts. It should not strictly act as a framework for defining, but to be understood more as an analytical tool for tourism business. The recent works of UNWTO to evolve a Standard Industrial Classification of Tourism Activities (SICTA) as a subset of ISIC would further strengthen the united efforts of identifying, defining, listing and measuring tourism and related activities, and institutions more clearly and accurately.

Despite tourism’s complex existence as seen above, it would not be logical to argue against ascribing industry status to tourism for a variety of reasons. First, it is sine qua non to further the already consolidated identity, measurement, data gathering, analysis and forecasting, development planning and management, and so on. Second, evidently, tourism as a major global, social and economic activity will continue to grow and get further strengthened as it matures. Third, inescapable—and at the same time systematically-practised—globalisation process necessitates tourism to be more organised as a sectoral activity so as to be more in tune with international negotiations within GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services), in order to draw desired benefits from tourism—more importantly for the developing countries. As per World Trade Organization listing (WTO 1998), only four sub-sectors of commodities are considered under tourism, and this list does not include vital components like transportation services, recreation services, sport services and cultural services. Indeed, viewing from the fast evolving contemporary socio-economic, political and technological environment, no sector, for that matter, can characteristically claim the industry status in the traditional sense, as their interconnected existence challenges many established tenets of an industry. Again, the global industrial structure has undergone drastic changes in the recent past, metamorphosing into ‘knowledge economy’ even in developing countries, wherein ‘services’ has positioned itself as the major contributor and growth driver.

It is also equally important to acknowledge that present day production system is no longer uni-linear in terms of products or production processes. In stead, it has evolved into
a complex process, with presumably offering economies of scope, value for money, preferences and satisfaction sought by the consumers. The dialectics of Fordist versus post-Fordist (that is, economies of scale versus economies of scope) production and consumption positions, perhaps, should be seen as ideology- and culture-driven; for, contemporary consumption patterns including that of tourism are not singularly demonstrative of any one single trait. Arguably, in the complexly driven markets and market conditions, where competition and value addition are the dictums, production mechanisms will strive for flexibility in order to differentiate and customise the products to a targeted niche market, a position close to Agarwal (2002) and some others. But niche market, by nature, is not only very small in size and therefore, expensive; but dynamic as well. As a result, it has to eventually transform into more of a Fordist-type mode for its long-term sustainability. For, the business history hardly has any product or industrial segment to cite as exception to this process. In tourism, for instance, many of the ecotourism products and markets suffice as best examples in this context. In other words, one could see contemporary industry segments in general, and most firms in particular, positioning themselves possibly close to the Fordist mode while strategically incorporating the elements of post-Fordist or ‘scope economics’ in order to remain competitive and also to maintain leadership and sustainability.

In their comment on ‘flexible specialisation’ in the ‘complex and inchoate polyglot travel industry’, Ioannides and Debbage (1998) amplify the friction prevailing in the Fordist versus post-Fordist debate. They argued that neatly bracketing the amorphous travel industry into purely pre-Fordist, Fordist or post-Fordist one is impossible, and as such, there is no clear chronological transition from one form of travel industry to another. The prominence of post-Fordist project in tourism, which coincides with Urry’s (1990, 1995) treatise on tourist gaze, positions that tourism consumption is consumption-dominant than production-dominant due to the inseparable nature of production and consumption. According to him, the production-based relationships are also significantly culture-driven. But, Ioannides and Debbage (1998) raise the concern whether it is appropriate to argue that the production-based relationship in the travel industry is significantly culture-defined. More so, the flexible production has normally been associated with many processes including the externalisation of ancillary activities and they point out that parts of travel industry have a long history of practising flexible labour practices.

For them, the adoption of new information technologies by travel industry has made the production flexible, as being manifested in the externalisation of ancillary activities, inter-firm strategic alliances and product differentiation through brand segmentation. Hence, they argued that travel industry can be classified as ‘neo-Fordist’ since it demonstrates varying degrees of flexibility enhancement within the context of its pre-Fordist establishments as well as dominant Fordist elements.

The ‘tourism product’ conception of Smith or the argument of Daniels and Bryson (2002)—that the ongoing transformation of advanced economies has yielded increasingly complicated production chains that frequently blur the boundaries between the services and manufacturing
Tourism as Discipline and Industry

sector—could be viewed as strengthening the above proposition. Perhaps, the efforts towards coalescing the economically, culturally and behaviourally driven perspectives to production and consumption are very suggestive of the need for re-approaching the conventional views of tourism production mechanisms and ‘industry’ definitions and classification systems. The framework thus created may be flexible so as to absorb the complexities, while at the same time a distinctive and easily identifiable one (and seemingly layered in some cases) even if such attempts will risk the criticism of ‘hybridisation’.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE

This critical review, while addressing two fundamental issues of disciplinary and industrial status of tourism has thrown open some important challenges—both theoretical and practical. On both these contentious themes of debate in tourism, this chapter has taken the approach that while there are merits in affirmative and non-approval positions; narrowing down the differences to affirmative perspective is important for the cause of a major socio-economic phenomenon like tourism. Whether one agrees or not, the fact remains that though tourism has taken firm roots in the academic institutions around the world, the process is visibly prominent only in a few English speaking nations, particularly the developed ones. The institutionalisation of tourism at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels is demonstrative in the number of institutions offering tourism as a ‘course’ and the volume of students passing out. The doctoral thesis being produced in the ‘tourism-proper themes’ have also been found in large numbers.

However, this chapter demonstrates the bias of tourism education, particularly to business or managerial aspects, which is deliberate due to the employability of the graduates and funding considerations. At the doctoral level, and also the researches being carried out by scholars in this field, it can be seen that the subject is being addressed from varying perspectives. This was clearly evident in the review of major journals like Annals of Tourism Research, Journals of Sustainable Tourism and to a large extent, Tourism Management and Journal of Travel Research. The journal Tourism Studies carries more reflective and critical writings addressing many of the fundamental contradictions discussed in this chapter. However, the overt emphasis of business and management aspects of tourism in the curricula is bound to influence the graduating students and this happens undoubtedly at the cost of understanding its developmental dimensions. This can be seen as another reason that constrains the holistic understanding of tourism development process. In view of this, it is argued here to divide the body of tourism knowledge into two: Tourism Business Studies and Tourism Development Studies. This would, by and large, suffice the purpose of minimising confusion about its identity; objectively attributing the focus like many other disciplines do, providing an option to the students to study tourism from the perspective they wish to and creating comprehensive tourism-specific knowledge base. This in turn, enables one to approach tourism as a business and management subject on one hand, and on the other, study it as an important
agent of development. The agreement among many scholars to offer the subject as ‘tourism studies’, indeed, can only contribute to compounding the contradictions prevailing, especially as a discipline. The bifurcation of the body of knowledge as proposed here, instead complements the ongoing process of according disciplinary status to tourism as a graduating discipline, and also to enable the development of more specific tools and techniques to further strengthen the scientification process.

Regarding the industrial status of tourism, the author argues that while large degrees of inter-connectivities still exist, and many goods and services are incidental to making tourism happen, it would be inappropriate to state that tourism is not an industry. Its structure, beyond doubt, is flexible; but, for that matter, even many conventional industries like automobiles have already embraced flexibility paradigms in their production process due to various strategic reasons like cost, technology, management practices, vertical integration or the like. Again, the ‘service’ industries segment in general cannot be accorded industrial status in ‘strict adherence’ to conventional wisdom (manufacturing or primary-sector specific) because there are no unanimous views on the definition. In reality, in today’s post-Fordist production-dominated industrial scenario, no industry can claim to be the ‘holy-cow’, untouched by the developments around it for the fear of losing its industrial identity.

Tourism has an identifiable production system but the main problem has been the treatment meted out to it by the national governments. With the exception of a few developed countries, the standard industrial classification system (SIC) does not acknowledge the importance of tourism as an economic activity. For instance, a country such as India, where tourism contributes nearly 6 per cent to its GDP and was also declared as an industry in the mid-1980s, is yet to incorporate tourism in its SIC in a desired manner. Needless to state, lack of an appropriate definition also contributes to its negation as an industry. But, solution to this may not lie in the acceptance of ‘tourism and travel’ industry definition being advanced by WTTC, since it could further complicate the defining and identification process of tourism industry. It is also not suggestive of adopting tourism satellite accounts (TSA) being developed and promoted by the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) because the system involves certain components having only little to contribute to tourism.

A rather credible approach to conceiving tourism industry would be supply-based because as Rugg (1973) observed: ‘traveler derives utility from being in the particular destination for some period of time’. While being there, they would consume three types of products, as being identified by Jafari (1982), namely tourism-oriented, resident-oriented and background-oriented. An industry classification based on fitting these functionally linked and complementary components in a single framework, though challenging, would contribute to evolving a unified and identifiable industry framework of tourism. By doing so, while reducing many criticisms, it could also benefit from more reliable industry-specific statistics that would eventually contribute to the evolution of appropriate policy mechanisms, and to a no lesser extent, an escape from being portrayed as ‘camouflaging’.
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Modern Tourism and Its Development in a Post-Modern Age

RICHARD BUTLER

INTRODUCTION

The nature of the development of tourist places and the continued evolution of tourism itself are subjects which have been addressed by many authors over the past half century. This chapter discusses the nature of the process of tourism-related developments, and the changes which tourism has undergone since it became a global phenomenon. It is argued that modern or current tourism, in what is known as the oxymoronic ‘postmodern’ world, is the result of evolutionary rather than revolutionary change and that the future of tourism will be similar in many respects to its present form. The logic behind this argument is discussed below and some examples are provided to aid the discussion.

Tourism is a large and complex phenomenon, with economic, environmental and socio-cultural implications for places and populations which become involved with it. It is both subject to change as a result of external factors and is itself a major agent of change. Tourism, like any other economic and social phenomenon, cannot be examined out of context. It is the result of the interplay of local, national and international forces, trends and mindsets, along with the influence of individual key actors, political ideologies, world events (natural and human) and changing tastes of consumers. Of particular significance for tourism is technological change. Where once people were confined to the distance they could walk or travel by horse, the advent of efficient road systems, followed by the introduction of steam power for rail travel and steam-powered rather than wind-powered water travel, and then by the combustion engine allowing for air travel, and finally the jet engine, have completely revolutionised the ability of people to travel to vacation and other destinations. Cost, rather than time or distance, is now the principal limitation to travel, and as travel costs have continuously declined over the last half century, coinciding with a general rise in living standards and incomes, at least in the industrialised world, the potential for tourism has increased enormously. Over the last two decades in particular, improvements and innovations in communications and information technology have made available to consumers greatly increased information and flexibility to
use that information, as well as helping to further reduce cost and time needed to arrange travel and other elements of vacations. The overall result has been a vast increase in tourist travel, driven by a much greater range of destinations and travel options being made available to and taken up by tourists. New destinations appear annually, reflecting the potential for income generation in those locations and also the potential traffic seen by those providing transportation, particularly low-cost airlines.

All of this growth, however, has somewhat served to mask the fact that tourism itself has not changed appreciably in many respects: as discussed below in more detail. The opportunities to engage in tourism in many more locations, at lower costs and for shorter periods of time have greatly increased the choices available to potential consumers. Similarly, there has arisen greater scope for specific forms of tourism, often of a more individual nature, particularly in terms of making arrangements and travel decisions. Thus, forms of tourism such as ecotourism, cultural tourism, heritage tourism and music tourism have been hailed as indicative of the ‘New Tourism’ (Poon 1994), although, in fact, these forms of tourism have been present since the beginning of tourism itself (Hibbert 1969). What is new is the scale of these specific forms, but as overall tourism numbers have greatly increased over the last half century, it is not surprising that the numbers engaging in specific forms of tourism have also increased, and thus become more visible to observers. This is not to deny that elements of tourism have become part of the ‘postmodern’ life, but it should serve as a reminder that many of the elements of tourism remain relatively unchanged, in spite of the fact that the scale and spatial patterns at the global level may have changed, and at the local level major developments have occurred. Such developments, however, always need to be examined in the context of the overall global change in areas such as technology, affluence and political stability.

Reasons for places becoming involved in tourism are varied. In some cases communities may see tourism as a means of economic development and be keen to become a tourist destination. In other cases, communities may be selected by individuals (entrepreneurs), by agents such as tour companies, or, as in earlier years, by railway companies, as potential tourist destinations and be developed accordingly. In a way similar to the effect of railway expansion in the nineteenth century, airlines—particularly the budget airlines—have been responsible for a rise in tourist visitation to a number of destinations simply by selecting them as suitable locations for new services from developed country markets. Irrespective of the way in which tourism has been introduced to destinations, the end results have been very similar in many cases. The impacts of tourism development have been well documented (see for example Mathieson and Wall 1982; Pearce 1995), and there is now a considerable body of literature on the way in which destinations develop and change as a result of the arrival of tourism (see Butler 2006a and 2006b). The commonality of many of the effects of tourism in terms of the process of development of tourist destinations has been noted by several authors and has been encapsulated in the Tourism Area Life Cycle (Butler 1980) model which is discussed and illustrated in two recent volumes (see Butler 2005a and 2005b).
The purpose of this paper is to introduce the nature of tourist development and the processes to which it gives rise in the context of destinations, particularly in the context of the development of supposed ‘new’ forms of tourism (Poon 1994). There are a considerable number of books on the subject of tourist and tourism development, and even more journal articles. The former often deal with the whole breadth of tourism, as may be thought appropriate (Pearce 1995; Wahab and Pigram 1997), since studying development requires examination of the geographic, economic and political contexts of locations, as well as the human element in the sense of both the population of destinations and the tourists visiting them. Related to these factors are those of marketing, investment and policies, along with transportation and access, and the general state of the world economy and stability of the destination region as a whole. Articles dealing with aspects of tourist development tend to focus on either specific destinations or specific elements such as crime, income and employment generation, or environmental and social effects.

**Development of Tourist Destinations**

The development of destinations would appear to owe much to chance and serendipity. Whims of entrepreneurs and of initial visitors, good or bad fortune in terms of physical events, fortuitous or unfortunate timing of economic or political events such as market downturns, increases in price of oil, revolutions or coups, can leave a potential destination stripped of its potential for a considerable time, while another place may suddenly benefit from a competitor’s misfortune. In many cases, such eventualities may not only be unforeseen but also unavoidable, in the sense that the causal events may be completely beyond the control of the destinations involved. A smooth, planned and controlled pattern of development of a tourist destination along a predetermined and anticipated route is the exception rather than the rule. Yet, it is argued, the end result in terms of the process of development is often very similar, and in many cases even the physical form or morphology of destinations may be very much the same (Stansfield and Rickert 1970). In terms of coastal destinations where the focus is the beach, or winter sports destinations where the focus is access to slopes, the morphology of respective destinations bears many similarities. In recent years, this may be because it may be the same architects and development corporations which are copying each other and using a tried and successful model: whereas, in earlier years, it was perhaps more a function of basic economic geography, namely, getting the consumer as close as possible to the main attraction and charging them more the closer they were to that attraction. Maximising access to the beach or the boardwalk influenced hotel and other accommodation, location and pricing, just as a room with a sea view still holds a premium in terms of price over one looking out on to a car park.

Tourism destinations face specific problems as they develop, which accounts in part for the similarity of the development process. What attracts tourists initially is itself subject to
change and even removal. Such change and disappearance may not be intended or even noticed for some time, and in some cases, it can be argued that it may not matter if the criteria for success are measured in a relatively short-term economic context. However, there is an inescapable fact—that those responsible for many destinations seem to fail to note or acknowledge that development inevitably means change, and changing the appearance and attractiveness of a destination almost equally inevitably means changes in market appeal. Tourists who came because a place was undeveloped, cannot be expected to return when that location is developed, or at least changed beyond a certain degree. What is unknown, in most cases, is what the limit of acceptable change to any particular market is, before that market rejects that destination and searches for another. As the market for a destination changes, new replacement markets have to be found, and inevitably, those new markets will demand a different set of facilities and attractions. As these are provided, new competitors will appear and destinations have to constantly examine their attractions and offerings to stay competitive.

A major problem is that few destinations have a single agency controlling their destiny. In writing this chapter, one rule of English has already been broken, that inanimate objects should not be personalised and given powers of action, by implying that destinations are capable of creating policies and shaping their own futures. In reality, of course, it is politicians, planners, private-sector developers, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and residents who do this (the ‘movers and shakers’ of Russell and Faulkner 1999), and they are often in disagreement with one another or even among themselves; but development and change goes on regardless. Plans will be made identifying locations for development and preservation; policies will be made endorsing plans and concepts such as sustainable development, when along will come a development proposal or a major transportation modification, which would appear to provide great benefits—normally economic—to the community, and plans would be revamped and policies changed. Rearguard actions to prevent development in many countries are rarely successful over the long term, and in many less developed countries such efforts may be unpopular if they appear at all, where economic development alternative to tourism does not exist. It is important at this point to argue that tourism is not always about development, and that development and change are not always negative in their effects. While academics are experts and chase for the facts to note the negative effects of tourism, governments and their consultants are equally effective at noting the economic benefits. Irrespective of the relative accuracy of either camp, the fact remains that in many tourist communities, tourism is regarded in a positive light, even though residents may be very capable of noting the problems it can cause and things they do not like about either tourism or tourists. In the same way, while everyone can identify the problems with automobiles, such as pollution, costs, road requirements, accidents and personal injuries, most people in developed countries own and use cars, and are very reluctant to give them up or reduce their dependence on them. Communities which are dependent upon tourism, see tourism not as an agent of change but as an agent of stability and necessity, and often see nothing wrong in expanding facilities and infrastructure to increase tourism in their community. If something such as tourism is providing jobs,
income and taxes to a community, and resulting in improved facilities and access, then it is unrealistic to expect residents of that community to want to halt further development without it being explained to them that further development may result in ultimate decline and abandonment of tourism, if certain thresholds are exceeded. To make such an explanation convincingly is extremely difficult, and to many people, would appear to be inconsistent and illogical, as well as potentially risky.

**Change and Stability in Tourism**

There is a widespread misbelief that tourism is highly dynamic, and constantly changes and takes on new forms in new places. There is no doubt that tourism is a dynamic phenomenon nor that elements of it do change frequently, but at its core it is remarkably static. It is essentially subject to iterative or evolutionary change, rather than revolutionary development, except in a very small number of areas. By this is meant, that most tourism destinations and forms of tourism develop with incremental changes on what has gone before. Thus, tourist destinations tend to contain ‘relics’ of an earlier period of development; the now anachronistic Boardwalk in Atlantic City, which is rarely visited by millions of gamblers; or the piers of particularly British coastal resorts. In some cases, the ‘Grand Hotels’ have survived, been upgraded and modernised, and are still attractive and elite, as a glance at Nice and Cannes, especially during the annual Film Festival will confirm. In other areas—the spa town of Atami in Japan for example—they have disappeared, moved down market or been converted into retirement or residential developments. Tourists may no longer come in great numbers by train as a century ago, but the streets leading from the station to the Peak Value Intersection of Stansfield and Rickert’s (1970) Recreational Business District still contain retail outlets catering to visitors more than to locals. Often, the pattern of seafront development is still dominated by functions which would be hard pressed to justify their existence or economic viability if they were being developed today.

Just as many destinations have continued to attract tourists, although often in declining numbers from their heyday, and perhaps for different purposes and different lengths of stay, so too the market has remained remarkably consistent. The bulk of tourists still go to the same destinations or certainly the same regions to which they have been going for decades. At the global level, there is great consistency and stability in tourism (UNWTO 2005). There would be absolute chaos if it were not so. Investment in tourism infrastructure is enormous and relies heavily on stability and return visits, at least over a reasonable period of time. Blackpool and Brighton in England have been tourist destinations for over 200 years (Gilbert 1939), as has Niagara Falls, and while they have changed beyond all recognition in that time, they still attract tourists from their original English urban family market. They do not attract an identical market (in the case of the English resorts, this is families staying for one or two weeks, travelling to and from the destination mostly by rail, while for
Niagara Falls, the market is mostly couples from north-eastern North America plus foreign visitors) but what the markets do when they are on holiday in those destinations is very similar to what the original markets did in those destinations a century or more ago (relaxing on the beaches and the piers in the English resorts, and viewing the waterfalls and visiting unrelated attractions at Niagara Falls). In many respects it would be difficult for them to do much else, although they may do things in a different way today and stay for shorter lengths of time, arriving by different modes of transport.

An observer of tourist behaviour in Venice or Rome, or indeed in any of the major destinations on the original Grand Tour (Towner 1985) would find the modern-day visitor engaging in almost identical activities. The pattern of behaviour described by Hibbert (1969) as to what was expected of a young aristocrat on his tour is remarkably similar to the behaviour of many people today. Climbing the highest building to observe the town (be it the Campanile in St Marks Square, the Leaning Tower in Pisa, or in a more contemporary vein, the London Eye, Toronto’s CN Tower or the Eiffel Tower in Paris) is a natural activity for many contemporary visitors to towns, as is visiting the local museums and great buildings, consuming local food and alcohol, collecting souvenirs (albeit plaster models and prints rather than original marble statues and paintings) and writing home about one’s visit. There are, after all, a limited number of activities in which a stranger in a city can engage in legitimately. The attractions of many cities listed in the various editions of The Lonely Planet or The Rough Guide today are little different to those listed in Baedeker’s guides or Thomas Cook’s lists of attractions to be seen in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

**Destination Response to Changes in Tourism**

Thus, tourists today go to many of the same destinations as did tourists two centuries ago, and undertake the same activities today, which their predecessors did then. Where new attractions have been added, they often mimic existing features; new museums, new places of entertainment, new locations for eating and drinking, and new facilities from which to view the city. Often, as older and less traditional tourist cities attempt to renovate themselves, particularly perhaps nineteenth century industrial cities such as Birmingham, they turn back to attractions and facilities that are based on historic forms of leisure. In the case of Birmingham, renovating the Canal Basin, providing walking areas and open piazzas for the public, and providing eating and entertainment facilities (Murayama 2004); in other words, attempting, with some success, to convert their town centres to something akin to what may have been found a century or two earlier, when people perambulated around a city centre and spent time eating, drinking and observing society. In conventional ‘holiday resorts’, the beach is still the primary attraction, although the ‘sun’ has become of much more significance than a century ago, but the three ‘S’s of ‘sun, sea and sand’ tourism shows little sign of declining in popularity, at least among the mass of tourists who seek these elements, sometimes, as in the past, with a fourth ‘S’ (sex) added.
The great dynamism in tourism in reality is at the fringes, and is often marked by the appearance of niches, beloved by marketers and frequently claimed as ‘the fastest growing segment of the market’. New destinations also tend to be described in similar terms. Given the global numbers of international tourists, some 700 million according to the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) (2005), perhaps 5 million engaging in ecotourism is not very important compared to 650 million engaged in mass tourism. The attention given to this one small element of tourism is all out of proportion to its significance and value (in academic terms it even has its own respectable refered journal, *Journal of Ecotourism*, and one might be forgiven for thinking that everyone was becoming an ecotourist and mass tourism was disappearing according to some predictions. Part of the reason for this is related to the reason as to why the term ‘sustainable’ is used so frequently to describe forms of tourism (and other activities).

The world is finally waking up to the fact that tourism, like most forms of economic activity, creates negative as well as positive impacts. Most of the negative ones in the case of tourism are in environmental and social/cultural areas, while most of its positive impacts are on the economic side. As many authors have pointed out in recent years (Butler 1999; Hall and Lew 1998; Wheeler 1993), the desire to appear to be addressing the problems of tourism can be seen to explain the great support, in principle, for what are stated to be more sustainable forms of tourism, including ecotourism. As Wheeler (1994), in particular, has pointed out very eloquently, much of such development is essentially window-dressing to allow the participants to either feel good if they are tourists, or appear good and market accordingly if they are suppliers. There is nothing new about ecotourism, except the scale at which it is being practised. People travelling to observe Nature represent one of the oldest forms of tourism. What is ironic (and unfortunate) is that the numbers now involved are so large that the places which they visit (often extremely fragile), and the species they desire to see (often highly endangered) are often under greater threat than they would have been without the advent of ecotourism, however well intentioned the suppliers and tourists may be. This is not to criticise unfairly those genuinely concerned about endangered species and environments, nor to deny that in some situations, ecotourism development can result in at least initial benefits for the environment, but one may legitimately argue that in many cases it appears that successful ecotourism developments often take on many of the characteristics of conventional (mass) tourism with similar effects over the long term.

There is always a great tendency to see developments in the contemporary period as something new and significant, and often to see or portray such forms as indicative of different trends and to be the originators of new patterns. Thus, in tourism there has been very great attention paid to supposedly ‘sustainable tourism’ and also to ‘New Tourism’, often with the corollary that the ‘old’ forms of tourism, particularly mass tourism, are declining. This is not only highly unlikely, but also misleading and naive. The statistics of UNWTO, for all their impreciseness, would appear to show at least one consistent trend over the last 50 years and
perhaps longer, and that is, virtually unbroken growth in total numbers of international travellers. Even allowing for the fact that UNWTO has a vested interest in showing those numbers, and thus the value and importance of tourism are increasing, it is generally accepted that tourism has increased consistently since the Second World War. The vast majority of tourists are what can best be described as conventional tourists, that is, they visit popular destinations, stay in conventional accommodations, use public transport and their own cars, and engage in a common set of activities. Many of them utilise the services of agents, including tour operators, travel agents and commercial airlines. It is acknowledged that a considerable and increasing proportion make individual arrangements through the Internet rather than using a traditional travel agent, whose services have not changed greatly since the days of Thomas Cook, but this does not mean that their tourism desires and activities have changed significantly, if at all. It must be remembered that ‘New Tourism’ includes not only individually arranged eco-tourism or gastronomic tourism, but also participation through package deals in mass raves and disco parties at Ayia Nappa, Ibiza and Falaraki. This latter form could, quite legitimately, be considered to be a new form of cultural tourism. Most tourism is still conventional mass tourism; it has been that way for more than a century and is likely to continue that way through the next century, although the way of making reservations and choosing destinations may continue to change.

CONCLUSIONS: CURRENT ISSUES IN TOURISM

In recent years, the decline of communism has added many potential tourists to the world total from the countries of Eastern Europe, as well as adding many potential new destinations, some, such as Prague, already sized on by the budget airlines. Many of the East European tourists are likely to travel as mass tourists, reflecting both their low budgets for some time to come, and the fact that package tourism is the easiest way to travel to foreign countries for those unfamiliar with this luxury. In addition, the world is only just beginning to experience the emergence to two potential markets that will make existing ones look small by comparison, namely those of China and India. The sheer size of their population base ensures that even if only a very small proportion of their populations are able to travel abroad, they will add large numbers to the existing market. If they travel in the same way as the Japanese began to travel abroad some decades ago (Iwashita 2004; Pearce 1987), then they will begin at least with package mass tourism to the major tourist attractions. Conventional tourist destinations are still needed and will be needed in the future to continue to cater to the vast majority of tourists, and it is important to be able to understand the process of development that they are likely to go through.

British tourist resorts are preparing for a change in national level policy on gambling and some at least are anticipating major casino development and seeing this as a key tool of rejuvenation. Few seem to have learned or wish to learn from the experience of Atlantic City
and other places which have used this method of economic rejuvenation (Stansfield 1978), and the predictable pattern of development and change which is likely to result. The rapid rise in popularity of destinations such as Prague and Dublin, as a result of changes in accessibility stemming from low-cost air links to the UK and other West European markets seems to have been viewed as a new permanent feature of life in those centres, rather than being seen as an economic boom which could disappear just as quickly as it developed. The life cycle of destinations and the pattern and pace of development have accelerated in the last few decades. A process which took destinations a century or more to complete, is now being experienced in less than a quarter of that time. Wolfe (1966) pointed out a long time ago that tourism growth cannot continue at a rapid rate in perpetuity, and places which have lost their unique attractions, and rely on common and easily duplicated man-made features face an uncertain and probably unsuccessful future over the long term.

There seems a failure to appreciate that attractions created on the basis of current or anticipated tastes are not likely to remain attractive to sufficient numbers of people in the future to assure economic viability, particularly when such attractions are often replicated in many locations. While this is not to argue that tastes do not change (the changing perceptions of mountains over time (Hall 2000) are proof that they do), it is appropriate to comprehend that some attractions such as the Pyramids, the Grand Canyon, the Great Wall of China and the masterpieces of the Renaissance are still capable of drawing large numbers of tourists to them. True sustainability involves more than nomenclature and requires the appropriate incorporation of economic, environmental and social elements to retain its long term appeal. In a decade or two’s time, the ‘New Tourism’ of the end of the twentieth century is likely to be seen as a minor perturbation in the long-term evolution of tourism and the destinations which serve it.
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Some Reflections on Tourism and Post-Colonialism

PETER M. BURNS

INTRODUCTION

The word ‘tourism’ works in a number of ways: as a description of leisure activity, as global business consumed at a local level and as a condition of postmodernism. Tourism, as a topic for analysis, is both enigmatic and bizarre. Enigmatic in as much that it is difficult to define and bizarre in that it sets out to make theoretical sense of people having fun. According to Dean MacCannell (1992: 1) that:

Tourism is a primary ground for the production of new cultural forms on a global base. In the name of tourism, capital and modernised peoples have been deployed to the most remote regions of the world, farther than any army was ever sent. Institutions have been established to support this deployment, not just hotels, restaurants, and transportation systems, but restorations of ancient shrines, development of local handcrafts for sale to tourists, and rituals performed for tourists. In short, tourism is not just an aggregate of merely commercial activities; it is also an ideological framing of history, nature, and tradition; a framing that has the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs.

Given the power that MacCannell describes, it becomes obvious that tourism, both as business and cultural phenomenon extracts value from destinations for the benefit of metropolitan tourism corporations. This extraction is metaphysical as well as financial given that appropriation of ‘other’ in a ‘conqueror–native’ relationship (Fannon 1986) is a distinct characteristic of contemporary tourism in short: post-colonialism. The size of global tourism adds weight to the assertion of power relationships dominating the consumption of place, space and other. In emphasising the sheer size of the sector, The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), an industry sponsored pro-tourism pressure group, along with the World Tourism Organization (WTO), regularly makes the following claims on behalf of tourism:

- it is the world’s largest industry;
- it is the world’s largest employer and creator of jobs;
- it accounts for one in nine global jobs (direct and indirect employment);
- it represents 10 per cent of global wages;
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- it is responsible for 10 per cent of world gross domestic product (GDP); and
- it accounts for 11 per cent of non-food consumer retailing.

While the extent to which these extraordinary claims are justifiable remains debatable (depending, for example, on who is making the claims, the definition of tourism being used and agreement about what constitutes a tourism job), they do however, emphasise the huge range of impacts arising from tourism’s cultural and economic dynamics.

**TOURISM AND DEFINITIONAL PARADOXES**

Tourism cannot simply be defined as a series of attractions or a product. The difficulty with this approach is that included in these so-called attractions or products will be private aspects of culture and lifestyle. The word ‘product’ implies something that is there to be marketed, wrapped and sold. A similar definitional paradox arises if tourism is seen as an ‘industry’. There are implications of a clear entity whereby things may be categorised as being part of the tourist industry or not. This is simply not possible. Are the Amish people, who for the most part want nothing to do with the twentieth century, to be counted as part of America’s tourist product? During the nineteenth century, the lunatics of Bedlam Asylum were considered attractions, and it was seen as amusing to visit them in their misery (organised trips of this nature became redundant in Thatcher’s Britain as cutbacks in the National Health system dealing with long term mental health and cynically labeled as ‘Care in the Community’ positioned the lunatics as an integral part of contemporary Britain’s urban landscape). As the Killing Fields of Cambodia and the Ho Chi Minh Trail inexorably find market niches in globalised tourism, anything becomes an attraction, even poverty and death. These uncomfortable, shadowy aspects of tourism illustrate the complexities of this global phenomenon, while exposing yet another paradox: the idea that tourism promotes international understanding (UN 1963). Yet it has been counter-claimed that the requirement of much of tourism is for a sort of zero relationship between host and guest (MacCannell 1992: 307).

Whatever the definitional complexities, tourism is a phenomenon of interlocking networks and modern mythologies. Tourism combines not only services, landscapes and culture, but also intangibles such as hospitality, customs and curiosities; a combination of services and enticing images as Lanfant (1980) describes it, but above all an integral part of the global capitalist development.

**TOURISM AS CULTURAL IMPERIALISM?**

Destinations are attractive in the measure they are unspoiled. Yet the very act of going to them spoils and despoils them. The westerner goes to find somewhere uncontaminated by westernization. His visit, in itself, contaminates…The western tourist is unable to escape his own shadow, and a protective wall of western comforts and debased imitations of local culture grows up around him.

— Harrison (1993: 58)
The quote from Harrison sets into context one of the biggest paradoxes for tourism’s relationship with the developing world; the seemingly elitist view that contact between cultures is inevitably polluting. The quote is clearly negative, but what is it that Harrison is talking about? Perhaps he takes a position akin to that of imperialism, which involved ‘the plundering of ancient stockpiles of wealth from pre-capitalist civilisations and unequal trade relations with dominated societies’ (Peet 1999: 105). If consuming culture is seen as plundering, then one can sympathise with this position. Clearly, tourism has a homogenising effect on culture, as nations become destinations that in turn become brand images ‘owned’ by powerful multinational corporations. It may be that contemporary tourism has risen in parallel with consumerism, a concept that Vance Packard (1956) negatively termed ‘consumer society’. Some four decades later, Bayley (1991: 47) relates the history of the word ‘consumer’ to the development of post-industrial capitalism. He notes: ‘Mass production and all that it entails — investment, long lead-times, low unit costs and ready availability — replaced a system where simple makers could articulate and satisfy needs; the new distant customers alienated from the production process became consumers’. How easy it is to apply this to contemporary tourism, and see the tourist and the new imperialist roving the world for new thrills and authentic cultural experiences.

The global web of advertising, reservations systems and buying power empowers the multinationals in their ‘rational’ maneuvering towards product standardisation and the ‘rationality’ of global markets. It is no coincidence that along with hyperinflation and unemployment, McDonald’s franchises [or ‘McGulag Archipelagos’ as Ritzer (1993: 131) called them] became the overpowering cultural and economic icon for what Reagan/Bush Sr. called the ‘New World Order’ (for a brief but important note on this phrase see MacCannell 1992: 309). Thus, we see that the variables which influence choices for individual consumers are defined not only by what the producers feel is more efficient to sell us, but also by the complex life-motivators that define postmodern living. Choices, then, are so bound up in consumerism and the ‘born to shop’ mentality that perhaps psychoanalysis is a better tool than reprehension in coming to terms with (or analysing) global consumer trends. Maybe, from the relative comfort of a Western middle class perspective, we use tourism as a metaphor for our own dissatisfaction with the world.

**TOURISM IN A POST-COLONIAL WORLD**

It is perhaps worth reminding ourselves, in relation to the above attempts to define tourism, that Third World governments did not enter into the garment industry to provide apparel for the fashion conscious, or develop cash crops in order to fill the plates of hungry Westerners. These are primarily economic (and to some extent political) activities, the intention of which is to bring in foreign exchange and create jobs. Given this axiom, it is obvious that Third World governments did not enter the tourism business in order to provide holiday destinations in
the sun, where exhausted workers from the industrialised North can recharge their batteries by relaxing in the unhurried and friendly lifestyle of pre-industrialised conditions. Perhaps, discussion on post-colonial arrangement of tourism would necessitate looking at its structural organisation in the colonial period, as summarised in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1 Tourism in the Colonial Era

- **Business organisation:** Companies and access (via ships and air) dominated by colonial power. Local elites beginning to enter the market.
- **Supply:** Hill stations, plantations shifting to resorts, standards imitating manners and values of ‘home’.
- **Colonial age of tourism** (pre-war years to early 1970s). Race and Christianity, the significant markers of relations and power.
- **Demand:** Business, exploration/expeditions. Individual/VFR. Very limited in scope. Missionary zeal to ‘tame’ the ‘ungodly’.
- **Support systems:** Mainly geared up to expatriate officers and families, troop movements, and trade needs. Leisure tourism low on political, economic and business agenda.

Source: Computed by author.

However, much of the debate about tourism’s effects is centred upon the Third World and has emerged through a wider post-colonial discourse. It is easy to understand why tourism between countries whose citizens enjoy relative equality of opportunity (social and economic); where there are distinct possibilities for reciprocal visits, is less problematic than between countries that have dramatic differences in living standards and far greater restrictions over travel aspirations and opportunity.

The way in which the international tourism industry and the Third World interacts presents a number of problems for social and political scientists (c.f. Ascher 1985; Britton 1982; Bryden 1973; Wyer et al. 1988). The concerns can be summarised as:

- the development of ‘islands of affluence’ in the midst of poverty;
- the use of scarce national resources for the enjoyment of wealthy foreigners;
- the ‘demonstration effect’ upon the local population of observing the mass consumption of indolence;
- economic multipliers, the main tool for ‘measuring’ the flow of tourist money through national economies, remain controversial and unreliable;
- the commercialisation of culture and lifestyles;
- the benefits are likely to accrue to foreign companies or local elites; and
- the reality of international tourism structures means that control is likely to be external to the destination and defined by transnational tourism corporations.

It is this last point, the likelihood of exogenous control of the industry and the reliance that has to be placed upon transnational airlines, hotel groups and service providers that is the root of tourism’s structural problems and identifies tourism’s role in contemporary post-colonial activities. While tourism planners and tourism master plans are increasingly addressing this particular problematic, it remains a continuing political challenge for Third World destinations. Richter (1989: 182), in her analysis of aid assisted tourism development efforts, observes:

Unfortunately, most how-to-do-it kits for tourism development have come in the form of advice from the World Tourism Organization or large travel industry firms interested in promoting this or that destination. As shown...[throughout Richter’s book] their advice is often at its best only concerned with large-scale, mass, or charter tourism and at its worst self-serving and misleading. In any event these organizations are concerned quite naturally with developing tourism and not with using tourism as a vehicle for development.

The dominance of tourism organisations from metropolitan centres in international tourism flows and the reliance upon foreign capital for destination development can be interpreted as a consequence of the colonial or other political systems that continues to frame the relationship between developing and developed countries. Lea (1988: 12) adopts a political economy approach to analyse tourism development as being a consequence of imperial domination of the Third World in the past and the pattern of trading links and spheres of influence established at that time. This reliance upon the developed world for capital investment and markets is picked up by Lea (1988: 13):

Metropolitan companies, institutions, and governments in the post-colonial period have maintained special trading relationships with certain elite counterparts in Third World countries. These representatives of the ruling classes gain most benefit from the less-than-equal share of income and profits that remain inside a peripheral economy.

As Richter (1989: 17) succinctly puts it, ‘Tourism development is a policy area only if political elites decide it to be.’ In South-East Asia, notably Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia, tourism has been developed with the aid of Western capital: in this sense, tourism has acted as a catalyst to further economic development; such economies have developed
quantifiably in the last decade. Richter (1989: 6) states: ‘The existence of tourism affirms the nation’s legitimacy and a faith in its internal security’. Countries that are not privy to this political bonhomie such as Vietnam, Burma, Cambodia and North Korea have neither been able to develop their tourism industry easily nor enjoyed the concomitant economic benefits. The case of tourism development being used to demonstrate political success was nowhere clearer than in the Philippines. Richter gives a fascinating account of how tourism was used for political advantage by the Marcos regime. Of special significance was the decision to hold the International Monetary Fund–World Bank Conference in Manila in 1976. Richter (1989: 56) comments:

The tantalizing prospect of hosting 5000 VIPs, even for just a week, led to a rush to complete 12 luxury hotels within 18 months, through the tourism master plan had not expected such accommodation needs for at least a decade...From a development stand-point, the expenditure of hotel financing alone is between 30 and 40 times the amount the government has spent on public housing.

The slogan devised by the Marcos regime to promote Philippine tourism, ‘Where Asia Wears a Smile’, hid the political agenda and lack of investment in the majority of the poor Philippine people. However, the conference was hailed a great success by the bankers, who were impressed by the tremendous redevelopment of Manila harbour, where the new hotels were, and the strong law and order situation that seemed to have been established under the Marcos regime. And yet accompanying the development—indeed, driving development as Bello and Rosenfeld (1992) would have it—has been a series of conflicts such as the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Cambodia, the political position of Hong Kong and the perceived threat of North Korea, illustrating the volatile political nature of this region shaped by the colonial encounter.

**DISCUSSION**

While descriptions and references to the brief encounters between unequals such as in O’Rourke’s documentary film *Cannibal Tours* (1988), may be poignant reminders of the post-modern conditions, and such meetings may carry severe consequences for the receiving population, the bulk of the world’s tourism takes place between relative equals, that is, as domestic or intra-regional travel, between European countries with comparative economic status or say, between the US and Europe. This means that the biggest cultural problem to do with tourism in terms of scale is that of congestion and overcrowding. In many cases, this is an accepted and expected part of the holiday experience. Visits to Coney Island, Disneyland or Paris in August are not motivated by a desire ‘to be alone’. Indeed, crowds and queues at the attractions, museums and fast food outlets might even be seen as part of the experience.
At first glance, this could place in jeopardy the general application of Greenwood’s (1989: 174) assertion that:

The anthropological view of culture is far different from the economists’ and the planners’ views of culture as a “come-on,” a “natural resource,” or as a “service.” The anthropological perspective enables us to understand why the commoditization of local culture in the tourism industry is so fundamentally destructive and why the sale of “culture by the pound,” as it were, needs to be examined by everyone involved in tourism.

But, while both the ‘host’ and ‘guest’ will develop coping behaviours, the large, diverse populations found in the developed world means that they are much better able to understand change than a society that has had limited contact with outsiders. The cultural impact on most of the cities and places mentioned above is diluted because they are already economically, socially and culturally diverse, and well-connected to the global level by well-established electronic and social networks. There is, then, a fundamental difference between contacts that occur between cultures of comparable strength and generally equal wealth and those between industrial or postindustrial countries and emerging economies. The issues of power and control frame the differences. While changes are made in all tourist receiving areas, it would be reasonable to assume that much of the pressure for change at tourist spots within industrialised countries is politically intra-cultural, that is, initiated by entrepreneurs or locally elected politicians in response to community pressure, planned and implemented by professional officers (architects, town planners, and so on) and received by the tourists as better hospitality, signage or parking facilities, and so on.

The powers that shape the receiving country’s economic structures and that shape its tourism industry and define and demarcate the pattern of arrivals are not only extra-cultural but located (or headquartered) in another country. In the case of less developed countries, the drive is often from central government responding to two types of pressure:

- The financial pressure of conflicting uses for budgets. For example, the various options facing a government might be: investment in tourism in order to generate more foreign exchange and jobs; investment in education to develop a more useful and responsive workforce; or investment in primary health so as to ensure a productive and healthy population.
- Pressures generated through the business needs of transnational tour companies (who, in return, are assembling a product to sell in the holiday marketplace) or their surrogates at a local level.

As indicated above, the milieu surrounding tourism, globalisation and culture is complicated. The late Nunez (1989: 271) noted, ‘Tourists and more often their hosts are always “on stage” when they meet in face-to-face encounters’. He explains that tourists would prepared themselves for their role by reading the literature and buying the appropriate costume.
The host will ‘rehearse a friendly smile’ and ‘assess the mood of the audience’. MacCannell too, in his analysis of tourism and ‘modern’ society (1989: ix) refers to ‘The current structural development of society [as being] marked by the appearance everywhere of touristic space. This space can be called a “stage set”, a “tourist setting”, or simply a “set”’ (MacCannell 1976: 100). Biddlecomb (1981: 23) quotes a polemic from Jean-Luc Maurer: ‘Everything about the behaviour of the Western tourist in the Third World is entirely artificial… [he is] no more than an object whose functions are manipulated and controlled.’ This is not a tenable position. It is both deterministic and applies a nonsensical generalisation that has no basis in fact and is alarmingly pessimistic even more so than Wheeler (2004), or Turner and Ash (1975). If we accept the argument of Maurer and his like, then there is no hope; there is nothing we can do about utilising the power of tourism for the common wealth.

Doxey’s (1976) work is specific to the effect on the relationship between visitors and residents at a given locale over time and as tourism increases. The most familiar theoretical perspective on how ‘hosts’ and ‘guests’ interact is probably Doxey’s Irridex ‘irritation index’ (1976). While it is not entirely clear whether Doxey perceived the process as deterministic, the description of how, over time and touristic pressure, attitudes in a given locale change towards tourists, is useful (allowing for its Eurocentric assumptions about reactions to visitors). Doxey takes as his starting point a situation of virtually no touristic activity. Thus there is a sense of curiosity and interest in the rare passing tourist. This proceeds through a sort of neutral view and finally on to a situation where tourists are seen in a totally negative light (paradoxically underpinned by a realisation of the economic dependency upon tourism, though this is not explicit in Doxey’s work). At this final stage, tourists and tourism become the scapegoats for all that is wrong with society. The danger for tourists is that they cease to be perceived by residents as individuals on holiday who might be talked to or who might be interesting or interested. Instead, they become an unidentifiable component of mass tourists. In a sense, they are dehumanised. As such they can be ripped-off, ridiculed, or even robbed (after all, their presence is transient, and the acts can be repeated as rich pickings). Tensions can be heightened when there are clear physical differences between visitors and visited, for example skin colour or icons of wealth.

Smith (1989) explores this theme in the broader context of the relationship between tourism and culture, indicating that different types of tourist will have different impacts upon the local culture. While the sexual metaphors of triangle (love triangle? Pubis?) illustrated in the triangular shape of the model and penetration—a word used in the explanatory text by Smith (1989: 14)—are probably unintentional, they are useful in reiterating sexual encounter as a strong motivational factor in tourism (either with other tourists as evidenced by the use of words and images in brochures aimed at the singles market, or with ‘exotic natives’ as implied by the prurient sub-text in the advertising of many international airlines (for example, Singapore Girl). The full and tragic effect of this is discussed by Minerbi (1992), with Lea (1988), providing a useful introduction. As Smith (1989) explains, the response to culture differs with the different type of tourist encountered. The proto- or incipient tourist, being few in number,
and in a locale unused to tourism (virgin territory?), will require very little from the ‘host’ population. Consequently, it is claimed that such tourists will have little impact on culture. In a simple sense, this is clearly true. However, account must be taken of the effect these trailblazing tourists will have over time. They will probably recount tales of their experiences to friends and other potential travellers and the appetite for tourism in the receiving area will have been whetted. The phrase, ‘see the place before the tourists get there’, is a familiar homily to readers of journalistic travel pages. The danger in this is that it allows the explorer to deny responsibility or any role in any development that may follow. Figure 4.2 provides an overview of some of the pressures arising from the interaction between ‘ex-primitives’ [to use MacCannell’s (1992), ironic phrase] and postmodern colonisers, the tourists.

**Figure 4.2 Tourism and Colonialism**

![Diagram showing the interaction between external political and economic pressures (including decolonisation and globalisation), artificial expectation, exotic ‘Other’ & ‘Paradise’, temporary, shallow, artificial relationships, clash between lifestyles & levels of prosperity, suspension/inversion of tourists’ normal behaviour codes, and the extent to which tourists adapt to local circumstances, reconciling economic gain with changing lifestyles, separating tourism impacts from others such as modernity, strength & diversity of local culture.]

*Source: Compiled by author.*

**CONCLUSION**

For some countries with limited physical size and resource base (such as islands, micro states), ‘not to have tourism is not an option’. The virtual collapse of the world primary commodity
market (George 1988; Harrison 1993 and the dramatic fall in world coffee prices at the time of writing), meant that in 1986, receipts plummeted to their lowest levels this century. Unfortunately, this decline coincided with a time when many developing nations had taken large loans from Western banks and governments against the security of high commodity prices achieved in the late 1970s and the early 1980s. This shortfall position left many developing countries with an urgent need to repay foreign debts but without the hard currencies to do so. Within this setting, tourism development in the 1980s became an important consideration for many countries, which continues to date.

Many governments of lesser developed countries, encouraged by the quantification of tourism, displaying rapid growth in tourism demand set against a background of a collapse in the commodity markets, interpret tourism as a complementary or substitute foreign exchange earner, for traditional commodities. The way the tourism industry has been established in developing countries displays many similarities in its pattern of development and reliance on Western markets, to that of primary crop production in a global economy, controlled from the metropolitan centres.

These points illustrate the reliance of Third World nations upon the industrialised countries (generally the ‘North’, including Japan) for tourism development. This leads to an unequal power relationship between investing, generating and receiving countries. The Third World receiving countries, in effect, have only limited control over how tourism is developed. Any private investor or major lending institution will have a range of criteria to decide where they will invest money for tourism development. Political stability and friendliness to the West is one of these. It is reasonable to speculate that Vietnam would have had a more substantially developed tourism industry than at present were it not for the trade embargo that had been placed against it until 1994 by the US. Developing countries have natural and cultural resources and assets to attract Western tourists—who are important not only in the micro sense of providing direct economic benefits to various locations but also, in a macropolitical sense, in helping confirm a politically acceptable image to attract further overseas investment in other sectors of the economy. The icons of development will be an important factor in giving an outward message of development and an acceptance of capitalist and possibly democratic values. Tourism can act as a substitute or complement economic benefits previously provided by primary commodities. Consequently, the emphasis framing development has been predominantly political and economic rather than social. There are even parallels to be drawn between the trade of tourism and primary commodity production between developing and developed countries:

- A heavy reliance upon the sale and branding of Third World destinations as commodified consumer ‘goods’ in the developed world.
- Need for overseas and foreign investment to develop the infrastructure and superstructure required for tourism development.
Reliance on foreign intermediaries such as airlines and tour operators to supply the tourists and market the destination.

Extreme vulnerability in terms of demand to economic and political factors such as world recession, increased oil prices, terrorism, changing market tastes in tourism generating countries and competition from other destination countries.

In addition to these structural problems of tourism, Lea (1988: 21) suggests that there exists:

Differences in approach...between a political economy model of international tourism, which seeks to explain present conditions in terms of evolving global relationships between rich and poor countries; and the functional view which aims to describe and classify separate elements to the tourism process...political economy approaches are generally negative about tourism's overall contribution to Third World development [while]...functionalists...[imply] that tourism is generally desirable and that problems can be resolved by adopting appropriate practices.

Tourism’s discourse cannot be separated from the wider political and historical debate. While there is no doubt about tourism’s ability to generate wealth, create jobs, act as an economic catalyst and create a favorable image for the destination country, underpinning tourism’s problematic is its failure to acknowledge that changes are needed in global economic structures that will enable Third World countries to establish a sustainable tourism portfolio that is independent of its colonial roots.
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Current intellectual discourse on tourism is extremely hegemonistic. To be able to find a space for a dissenting voice is to be termed a ‘terrorist’. It is interesting to note that just as in other disciplines, so also in tourism, issues of definition are coloured by the intellectual tradition that dominates the discourse. In the discipline of tourism, Western cognitive and perceptive categories refuse to seriously engage with other or plural and multicultural discourses, and categories. ‘Orientalists’ like Turner and Ash (1975), Cohen (1974), or MacCannell (1976), have in the Western discourse attempted to raise the legitimate concerns of the visited in the tourism discourse and defined modern tourism as an ‘encounter’ between ‘guests’ and ‘hosts’. When one compares this definition to that of Boorstin (1962), who defines the tourist as a philistine, then certainly the issue of the definition of tourism, its activities and its impacts on the destination become rather complex.

The Definitional Issue in Tourism

In the context of the unparalleled growth of tourism since the end of the Second World War, the debate on tourism is presently at a crossroads: in which direction do we take the North-South dialogue, if the definition of tourism and its distinguishing characteristics, when compared with leisure and recreation are to be taken into account? In such a comparison, the definitional boundaries are extremely fuzzy, and therefore, have implications for the tourism phenomenon.

Leisure is generally considered ‘free time’, when the tasks and chores of well-being and lifestyle have been taken care of. It is difficult to define sitting and chatting with casual visitors as leisure. This may be considered a part of social obligation as well. Do the unemployed consider their eight-hour workday as leisure, when they are out of work? In flexible timetables, should we consider the spillover of tasks before determining ‘free time’? Is there a subjective dimension to leisure, or is there only an objectification of defining parameters? Therefore, many have considered leisure an attitude of mind as well as expenditure of time. Recreation
is an activity located in ‘free time’, which refreshes the physical and mental/spiritual needs of an individual, social group, community, and such others. Therefore, recreation is linked to an availability of ‘free time’ and the activity engaged in at that time. If there is no ‘free time’, is there no recreation? Is a coffee-break at work, recreation? Is a commuter-line a recreational pastime? Can a holiday then be classified under recreation?

Some researchers (Cohen 1974; Evans 1976; Nunez 1977; Reiter 1977) have suggested that there is a continuum with home based recreation at one end and travel to some distant location at the other end. However, this locator (that is, holiday) does not distinguish tourism from other such uses of leisure time from recreational activity. Mathieson and Wall (1982) have put together a definition which clubs time, distance, activity and services under the rubric of tourism. This kind of clubbing leads to inflationary data on the phenomenon of tourism that ends in an illegitimate support to tourism in countries, which are at the receiving end of the impacts of this umbrella term ‘tourism’.

THE TOURISM DEBATE

Generally, in the tourism debate, it is assumed that Orientalists who have looked at guest-host issues in tourism, which determine the parameters of the debate (Smith 1989), are writing only for Western audiences that who are primarily English speaking. There is thus, complete or partial ignorance of other critical discourses in languages that have a colonial connection: French, Spanish, Dutch and German that cover a large part of the ex-colonised world. With the intervention of intergovernmental agencies like the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) and industry think-tanks like the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), tourism has successfully globalised regions that we have now termed as developing and less-developed countries. A better term, the Third World has been coined, with the acceptance of the concept of a unipolar world. There has been consistent rethinking of the concepts of Nationalism and Nation in the post-World War II context in these countries. This conscious movement for a new identity has prompted the discourse on tourism to take a new direction, through the application of anthropological, sociological and philosophical categories that have expanded their application beyond their psychological, geographical and socio-cultural parameters. This we perceive as an illegitimate activity. As tourism transforms the Self and its objects; the people and destinations they visit are not transformed in equal measure. In fact, they perceive a sense of loss, of paying a price for the presumed benefits of hosting tourism.

Can a passport determine the cross-cultural encounter between tourist and resident? Is it a frontier that will classify a tourist as international or domestic? In the new politics of self-determination and local autonomy, can we change the articulation of the forms and types of tourism? Can we look at all migrations that are temporary as tourism, and retain the long- and short- or medium-term movement as the classification of forms and types? In the impact analysis, the classifications have led to commerce- and market-determined types of tourism activity; for example, ecotourism, rather than people determined terminology. It is interesting
to note that local communities do not distinguish between forms and types of tourism. For them, all temporary visitors are tourists who want the same services from them. Any visitor outside of this scheme of things can often find that the transformative aspects of tourism are not realisable because the residents and host population do not perceive them as tourists.

**WTO Definition**

It can be argued that the definition of tourism that is in coinage at present, is both too general and too restricted. In 1963, the Rome Conference on Tourism defined only international tourists as: ‘… temporary visitors staying at least 24 hours in the country visited and the purpose of whose journey can be classified under one of the following headings: (1) leisure (recreation, holiday, health, study, religion, sport); business, family, mission, meeting….’ In 1978, UNWTO defined tourists as:

...visitors who spend at least one night in the country visited (b) foreign air and ship crews who had a lay over and used accommodation establishments in the country visited. Visitors who do not spend at least one night in the country visited, normally included in excursionists category, since they return to their transport unit for the night…. (i) the main purpose of visit as defined by the Rome Conference, 1963.

This definition that is so easily referred to by intergovernmental organisations, governments and the travel trade or the tourism industry is so set that one’s conclusions are almost predetermined. Consequently, the role visualised for tourism by statesmen at the end of the War—to foster peace, goodwill and international understanding—has been side-stepped, and the focus has shifted to its economic benefits. In recent years, argument for legitimising of leisure and recreation is seen resting on contemporary development jargon rather than social and cultural values of right to leisure and other embedded concerns. In fact, we often tend to overlook these original reasons for which there was social sanction for tourism.

Cohen (1974) attempted some clarification of the definition by adding ‘novelty and change’ to the attributes of a tourist. This inclusion also defines a tour as ‘relatively long and non-recurrent round trip’. He also distinguishes between ‘tourism proper’ and forms of what he calls ‘partial tourism’. He also distinguishes between ‘sightseer’ and ‘vacationer’. He then shifts his interest to ‘typologies of tourism’ because definitional issues are too difficult to refine upon or come to an agreement on.

A second issue related to the definition is that it serves as the basis for data and documentation, and therefore, for the logic of the pre-eminence that is being given to the tourism industry through the WTO Business Council and the WTTC initiatives in different countries. Both of them represent the same interests and, that is, transnational companies that control the tourism business. It appears that the intellectual position of the current discourse, when it turns to the new destinations and their peoples and cultures, reflects Critical theory’s use of the Marxian critique that ‘they cannot represent themselves; they must be represented’.
Marx’s reflection on the French peasantry in the ‘Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte’ is an apt reflection on the nature of the tourism discourse. In referring to the European poor and toiling masses who could not unite in the face of their oppression, he could as well have been talking of the ex-colonised poor, who continue to be unrepresented in the decision-making process. Marx goes on to say, ‘Their representative must at the same time appear as their master.’ Tourism policy and planning is undertaken at the central ministry level by the industry, bureaucracy and politicians, and not by the concerned communities and people. Today, when civil society organisations are putting the tourism issue on the agenda, they are not invited as representatives of the grassroot communities whom they advocate (Richter 1989).

Thus, common interest and business are represented as tourism, without taking into account the concept of scale that geographers use to attempt to make the definition more representative. What this implies is that, as more questions are raised, attention is directed to smaller pieces of the puzzle. One suggestion is to look at tourist generating markets and tourist destinations, and to determine whether there can be interchangeability between the two terms. What this suggests is that, for instance, today India cannot be seen only as a destination. The growth rate of outbound tourism from India and also China is likely to shift the profile of this region, with the saturation point of tourism being reached in Europe and the United States. To put it simply, who represents the destination — the generating market or the destination service providers, or the people whose way of life and culture are termed ‘attractions’. For example, the Incredible India campaign led by private consultants, WTO and the Ministry of Tourism on behalf of the tour operators, hoteliers and other service providers represents the workers and residents of the destination who are already struggling for safety, security, infrastructure, leisure and recreation, which tourism is further endangering by appropriation and closure that defines the resource use and organisation of tourism establishments.

Similarly, the kind of debate that the Scheduled Tribes (Rights to Forests) Bill (2005), has provoked between conservationists and local community movements in India, indicates that the problem of representation identified by Marx is still an issue. The Ministry of Tourism has again, in its ‘representative’ capacity, identified 55 villages in India for rural tourism, a new category. Was this issue discussed in the Parliament with the local representatives? Was a subcommittee formed? What was the process by which prior and informed consent was taken? Which structures of social representation and power sharing were consulted and how were the issues addressed? As the continuing claims and counter-claims indicate, these issues remain unaddressed.

**Issues of North–South Divide/Discourse**

The tourism discourse, as Said proclaims in his definition of an Orientalist, by a sleight of hand, not only takes on the political discourse in tourism. It also takes on the role of depiction of Orientals as exotic, living in a phenomenological life world, which by virtue of being
pre-industrial (now described as traditional in a pejorative sense), has to be transformed into postmodern categories that define tourism today. These generalities are the focus of much of the motivation that is promoted as the basis of the attraction of postmodern package tourism. ‘An Oriental lives in the Orient, he lives a life of Oriental ease, in a state of oriental despotism, and sensuality, imbued with a feeling of oriental fatalism’ (Said 1996). It is for this depiction that the term ‘Orientalism’, as theorised by Said, has become a term of abuse. But we, who live in the reality of the tourism discourse in the Orient, see ourselves as a new kind of Orientalist who has a different definition of our scholarly method. We do not define our ‘Selfhood’ in relation to the ‘European Other’, but within our own representative categories. It is only in this form that we can truly perceive our plurality and respect our levels of modernisation, on our own terms.

Second, not only has the right of depiction been taken away from ‘host’ populations, but the right to scholarship (since foreign scholars have the resources and the motivation) has also been appropriated. This indicates the old rationalist and methodological superiority syndrome of academia in the West. In our indigenous tourism discourse, colonialism and its present variations are not the only influences on the way we think about tourism. Perhaps the French and Soviet revolutions have shaped our scholarship in equal measure. To this, we may add the development of the scientific method to create an independent body of knowledge concerning Indian tourism through categories developed by our national schools of history, and by the application of documentation and data collection that have brought new information to light on our past and present.

Since tourism is said to be the fastest growing industry that will ultimately overtake oil, I would like to endorse the metaphor of ‘gluttony’ used by Amin (1998) to describe current capitalism, which is also apt for International Tourism. According to Amin:

No social phenomenon unfolds in a regular, continuous and unlimited manner. The evolution of any society thus necessarily goes through phases of expansion, stagnation and even regression. The points at which there is a change of direction are then termed crises. This general concept applies to all societies throughout history, and it is valid for all aspects of social life, whether economic, political or cultural.

Therefore, when we look at the issue of definition, we discuss the problem as a part of the philosophy of history rather than as a set of positivistically authenticated facts.

To return to the actual definition coined by WTO, we may say that the general acceptance of tourism as leisure and recreational activity linked to going away ‘for more than 24 hours, from the place of normal domicile and work, without earning any remuneration’, really describes many activities, which are not counted as tourism. Yet again, there are many activities that are counted as tourism but which strictly are neither recreational nor leisure-oriented. For example, sporting events are recreational and leisure-oriented, but they earn some prize money for the participants. Should we disqualify cricketers and tennis stars, as well as those
who win at the gaming machines and casinos? Again, if we are only looking at the foreign exchange earnings, then businessmen are tourists even when they never step out of the convention halls or meeting rooms and participate in recreational activity. Can the business cocktails be termed leisure? Although ‘break aways’ are being termed leisure, the underlying reasoning is that business which cannot be clinched in formal structures can find a ready solution in more unstructured forms. This should not be confused with leisure. Can their location in a hotel determine their relationship to tourism? The limits of expanding the concept of ‘discretionary’ are very evident in the data that the WTO and WTTC front is pushing around the world, as the number of arrivals and income earned through world tourism activity.

Similar problems arise while attempting to find a scientific boundary to the issues of expenditure, space and location, when purpose of the trip/tour and distance are not included as coordinates, since some of the typologies, like business, health, study and religion, included under tourism would then be excluded from the count. What about the necessity of travel and stay? Do these terms then create a dividing line between recreation, leisure and tourism? Inclusion of forms like VFR (visiting friends and relatives), and health and pleasure are also very inexact and subject to interpretation. Why did the League of Nations in 1937 not include pilgrimage? In Rome, in 1963, the temporary nature of tourism extending beyond 24 hours was stressed on. Refugees are temporarily settled in camps or in countries other than their own until a safe return to their homes is possible. So why are they not tourists? Their purpose is well-being. In 1976, the Tourism Society of the UK defined tourism as movement for all purposes including day visits. Obviously, this is too broad. So the 1981 definition stresses activity by choice and undertaken outside the home environment, that may or may not involve overnight stays. What is the guideline to determine the choice that operates within the coercive force of the media, opinion leaders, political ideologies, and so on, which reflects manipulation of the 4Ps (product, price, place and promotion) by the marketing professionals? WTO has added the issue of purpose-of-travel that is unconnected with employment or remunerative activity. Researchers who travel to popular destinations for their own purposes and therefore qualify for the ‘voluntary’ tag would be excluded. Issues have also included the consumption of services, but how do we include atmosphere, ambience and culture as services?

As we can see, even ‘motivation’ as criteria for tourism is very much centred on one cultural mode. Even if one were to compare the Pilgrimages, different cultures and ethnic groups see such participation in ‘religious tourism’ in different ways. Maslow (1970) assumes a hierarchy of needs where tourism comes very much lower than physical, and law and order needs of individuals. Domestic tourism in India, particularly Pilgrimage, would completely overturn this hierarchy. These are the issues of externalities that have not been taken into account in determining, for instance, why terrorism in Kashmir should reduce tourist arrivals in India or why the Gulf War should be a threat to tourist arrivals in South-East Asia, whilst street crime in London, New York or San Francisco should not impact tourism to the UK or the USA. Are we missing something in the definition?
In 1976, the World Bank held a seminar with United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) where the issue of definition was addressed. Their report says:

> It is difficult to define who is a tourist or to put tourists into categories. Different studies of tourism serve different purposes. people travel for different reasons...an attempt must be made, however, to define and classify tourists and to ascertain the essential elements of the tourism phenomenon.

Cohen (1974) has attempted to isolate the attributes of the tourist: ‘a voluntary, temporary traveller, travelling in the expectation of pleasure from the novelty and change experienced on a relatively long and non-recurrent round trip’. Novelty and change, for Cohen, represent both institutionalised expectations and behaviour that corresponds to these expectations. He then distinguishes tourists from those for whom tourism is incidental. He distinguishes the sightseer from the vacationer, where the former is interested in novelty and the latter towards facilities and amenities. But both attempts lost sight of tourism and had to bring in the term ‘Traveller’, a term which has replaced Tourist. Cohen also sees the difficulty with the term ‘pleasure’ and the concept of distance in his definition. Since the definition is subject to doubt, most theoreticians have branched off into typologies to overcome the problem of defining a social phenomenon that remains indefinable. We have terms like mass and drifter, environment bubble, centred or seekers of alternative centres but all these types of tourists are spawned by the affluent twentieth century institutionalisation. The weakness of typologies is that they have been constructed for a specific purpose and do not have universal application.

**Volumes and Victims**

The host population is cloaked under insider-outsider terms, which then leads to the classification of tourism as an ‘encounter’ and the result is stereotyping of both tourists and hosts. In this process, we lose the ability to build goodwill and mutual understanding. The motivational research also leads to the problems of authenticity, although MacCannel does see a higher purpose in tourism in the secular sphere. The indigenous leaders of the Australian Continent have now contested Horne’s (1976) application of this sense of tourism to package-tours at Ayres Rock. Robinson (1986) is much nearer the truth that those who have leisure, social sanction to take a vacation and the technology to ensure the organisation of the vacation, access tourism.

**The Myth of Ecotourism**

To bring the definition closer to forms of tourism that somehow cross the line between leisure and recreation without defining the boundaries of any of these activities, let us look at the ecotourism debate. Given the mass nature of tourism today, many non-governmental
organisations (NGOs) addressed the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) at the International Year of Ecotourism (IYE) 2002 (8) to point out that where tourism was unregulated, ecotourism would also be unregulated and would lead to inflationary and misconceived mass tourism in ecologically sensitive areas. Besides this, it would also add to the pressure of globalisation to displace and dramatically change the lives of those who had stewardship of the resources of these areas by virtue of their lifestyle, world views and spiritual values. In response, UNEP has taken the view that 160 Natural World Heritage Sites are under-visited and wherever negative consequences have been observed, they have been due to poor management.

UNESCO, on the other hand, has a different view and has pointed out that the governments and the tourism businesses really do not have conservation or management in view. They are looking at the numbers and the money. There is case in point in the manner, in which the tourism sector has been opened under General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), where the multinational corporations (MNCs) are looking to enter the service sector in tourism if there is to be liberalisation for foreign direct investment (FDI). The growth of services in World Trade now defines the new route for the free flow of capital around the world. Through this procedure, MNCs will get national treatment, that is, all the incentives and rebates that have been given to native services as well as the permission to bring in their own personnel, and repatriate profits, regardless of the lifecycle of the resource or the numbers that would come to the destination.

The contradictions between social and environmental sustainability, and the unfettered growth and expansion of tourism, which is a highly fragmented and unregulated industry, can be ignored only at the peril of the present inhabitants and their future generations. Micro projects, of short duration are cited as best practice cases and are presented at International Bourses and seminars as well as at training and capacity-building workshops. The long-term use of scarce resources and their pollution due to the arrival and stay of large numbers has been observed in many countries of Asia and Africa. Whilst tourism has grown, so has poverty; so has disease; and so has the exploitation of the weaker sections of the population, like women, children and indigenous as well as backward communities. While managers look only at the issue of over-visitation, civil society in the destination is concerned with structural problems associated with tourism, as well as ecotourism that include commoditisation of nature through corporate takeovers, and bringing cultures and people into the global market place when they do not have the ability to compete and/or control their future. This will only increase the injustice and inequality between countries. The question raised is, whose design and whose development model?

**TOURISM IN DEVELOPMENT**

Let us consider here a model of ‘tourism flows’ designed by Williams and Zelinsky (1970), which was based on 14 countries that had stable tourism flows over a few years, and accounted
for a bulk of world tourism flows. The three factors identified as the main determinants are as follows:

- distance between countries (the greater the distance, the smaller the volume);
- international connectivity (shared business and cultural values); and
- general attraction of one country for another (tourism bubble or orientalism).

The second model is the ‘gravity model’, known as pull-and-push factors that generate flows. Pull factors refer to attractions of a destination, both man-made and natural, including services and infrastructure, while push factors relate to purchasing power and other aspects of the propensity to consume tourism services and activities. In marketing manuals, the critical base of the gravity model is ignored. The larger the mass of pull and push factors, the greater will be the volume of the flow between the pull-push factored destinations. These factors are constrained by time, cost and distance, which are not reflected in the definitions of tourism. These models gain their legitimacy from the facts driven by industry that tourism is fast becoming global tourism industry. Facts are said to be neutral, even when they are collected on the basis of ‘representative’ samples based on contested definitions. All users of data, and these exclude local community representatives and social movements, can use these facts. Evaluation of tourism as a benefit is more in demand than the monitoring and impacts of its growth in some fragile and less developed regions of the world (Rao and Liyakat 2004). While WTO maintains the volume statistics, where are the monitoring and impact studies? Definitionally, they are not important, since the definition currently only looks at volumes and to push the agenda of the tourism business around the world. On the other hand, the legitimacy of mass tourism that is currently based on its volumes is being contested, not only by social movements but also by policy makers. Mass tourism has exceeded its carrying capacity all over the world. Every country wants to have quality tourism that is high spending rather than mass tourism.

Whilst promotion and marketing of ecotourism has raised the passionate interest of the tourism business, inadequate understanding, research and review of tourism, and its rampage across the world has not received equal emphasis. The UNEP-WTO joint initiative has gone ahead with framing ‘global guidelines’ and ‘information packs’ for governments, without taking into account the varied and genuine concerns of those who have been visited and those who are awaiting visitors. An example is the recent decision of Henry Ford IV to set up a USD 300 million ski village in Jagatsukh, in the Kullu Valley in the state of Himachal Pradesh in India (The Indian Express, 2005). The project envisages a 600 room five star hotel, 300 chalets and gondola lifts to take the tourists up to the village, after parking their vehicles in a 2000 car park at Naggar. This area has been identified as a heritage zone in the Kullu-Manali Master Plan of 1988. Though the consultants have been critical of tourism in Manali, whilst correctly identifying the mountains as the reservoirs of life-sustaining resources, they promote
their large project in a most fragile area which is to be kept out of developmental intensity, as sustainable.

We can, therefore, arrive at the conclusion that the thrust in all these exercises was aimed at portraying that ecotourism is ‘different’, although the existing definitions do not indicate any difference. They only point to a lack of clarity or conceptual coherence. Words like Nature, scenic beauty, sustainability, forests, mountains, coastal areas and species that are endemic to this environment, are all objects of ecotourism. It appears to be a form of institutionalised sightseeing of another part of civilisation, where urban dwellers try to recollect a vision of their civilisation’s past. How it can structurally disengage itself from the complex international tourism system, is never addressed. To understand ecotourism and its nature, practice and impacts requires research on the macroeconomic, social and cultural consequences of a mindless globalisation that is now pushing frontiers in the world beyond sustainability. Issues like patenting traditional knowledge, seeds and strains of agricultural produce, and breaking the survival and security bonds of communities (that have already taken place) never feature in the discourse on the best practice, sustainability and poverty alleviation. As large numbers of farmers commit suicide in the agrarian belt, we see the vanishing of species and piracy, accompanying these trends.

Ecotourism does not shut the door on other commercial activities. These will escalate the competition for resources. A case in point is the current debate between those who are backing the Tribal Rights Bill to be tabled in Parliament and those who believe that this Bill will destroy wildlife and the forests of India. Tourism in India’s major protected areas was not able to protect the tiger from vanishing. They vanished from Sariska and are invisible in Ranthambore, Kanha and Bandhavgarh parks. There are suggestions to increase numbers through controlled breeding. As long as the market for tiger parts and bones exist, there will be poaching. As long as there is tourism, there will be displacement and a change that is irreversible. There is evidence that India’s biodiversity has been retained only because it did not commercialise the protected areas or put them into private hands. India did not follow the colonial concept of stewardship, where no rights were given to local populations, which preserved the colonist’s rights to commercially exploit resources. These were unwritten or undocumented rights. Even the current Bill (Tribal Rights) does not put the forest into private hands; it protects the right of the communities settled in the forest to husband the resources and earn a living from these resources as stakeholders rather than as private owners.

However, the tourism industry prefers the closure model because all resources around a notified area are privatised and the forest is also looked at as a commercial resource. Can we then conclude that tourism is at an end? That it will generate so much resistance that tourists will stay home? This is a difficult question to answer and it can only be approached through an analysis of the tourism encounter, which can perhaps lead to a better understanding of the structural weakness of tourism as it is organised and institutionalised today. It is only through such painstaking efforts to refine definitions and show how meaning, in inter-cultural exchanges, can only be understood through accepting that democratic and equal values be
accorded to all cultures and peoples, so that we may rework our way forward to global understanding and peace through tourism encounters. Unless we give due importance to the manner in which peoples and communities process discussion and debate, solutions in the tourism discourse will defy consensus.

Towards Peace and Goodwill

In the practice of tourism, we cannot deny that we live in violent times. We cannot forget that we live in a world where diversity at every level defies description, and therefore, the homogeneous approach will not be able to represent our varied realities, entitlements and interests. The vulnerability of tourism, tourists and its practitioners creates a positive space for a new vision. There should be an attempt to endorse the multi-stakeholder process to get out of the charmed circle of ideological discussions. The debate does not take into account a conflicting world view that can be as rational as the dominant one: that democracy can be approached through the market. There is no doubt that a personal and eyewitness account, based on an unfettered engagement between the visitors and the visited, is bound to generate solidarity for issues confronting the spread of tourism around the world, and therefore, asking for a re-evaluation of its definition, if its legitimacy is to be re-validated, is essential. This would require that the knowledge pushed to the margins by ‘rationality’ has to be recognised, documented and brought into the mainstream, as an alternative way of looking at the world. There can be no end to the issues thrown up by the definition dialogue, and it is essential to take on this debate if one is to go beyond market fundamentalism to try to understand tourism in all its complexity.

As we try to create a new paradigm, we hope to take the discourse towards:

- Facilitation: let us use public hearings at tourist destinations to ask for a definition of tourism.
- Non-hierarchical: let us ask ethnic groups, women and children, and communities as to what development means to them. Let us strengthen their capacity to determine the future of tourism rather than assuming the Rights discourse to represent them.
- New Political System and Ethics: let us allow communities to restructure the interface between their smaller world and the general ‘public good’, rather than to make both hostage to formal institutions that have been inherited from the past.

By this new direction, we can define tourists as non-stakeholders, where tourism will become the venue for sustainable use of our planet, it’s people, cultures and their resources, for activities not only related to leisure, recreation and pleasure, or novelty and change, but to bring together, on humanist principles, the travellers and the visited. The test for tourism would then be the ability to bridge the gap between stakeholders and non-stakeholders. It would
be a rejection of a definition that puts consumers against service providers, and both against resident communities, on the basis of profit. Success, then, will not be seen in increasing volumes, but in the generation of goodwill and understanding that another approach can determine our combined future.
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Introduction

Hawkers, shoe shiners, car watchers and washers, unofficial guides, prostitutes, beach boys, street vendors, accommodation proprietors, boat keepers, bicycle rentals, food stall owners, commission agents, rickshaw drivers, currency exchangers, beggars, beach masseuses, drug pushers, unregistered porters, street-side hairdressers, barbers and beauticians, stage performers, sidewalk entertainers—and so on and so on. The list of small-scale business operators that exist on the fringe of the formal tourism sector is ever so long. For holiday tourists visiting developing countries, everyone but those spending the entire vacation within a fenced-off enclave will experience contact with this informal sector; and even among enclave tourists, most are likely to encounter the informal sector since this often can be found on the fringes of the enclave territory (Shaw and Shaw 1999).

Among holiday tourists, some interact more frequently with the informal sector than the others do. The degree of interaction has to do with a number of factors, for instance, the organisational and itinerary set-up of the holiday, the amount and character of activities, and the degree of seclusion during the holiday. Yet, such factors only partially explain the greatly differing degree of tourists’ contact with and use of informal sector services. However, the problem is that our knowledge of the interconnection of tourism and the informal sector is still rather sketchy. This, despite the fact that, not only does the informal sector characterise the tourism industry throughout the developing world, as Crick (1994) argues, informal sector activities are also found in connection with tourism throughout the rest of the world.

The modest knowledge on tourism and the informal sector is contrasted by a rapidly growing knowledge on small tourism businesses (for example, Friel 1999; Go and Appelman 2001; Smeral 1998; Thomas 2000, 2004; Wanhill 1997, 2000). Furthermore, while the exact character of this knowledge obviously varies, two common underlying understandings can, nevertheless, be discerned. The first is that the tourism product, that is, the destination experience, very often is highly dependent on the existence of a variety of small tourism businesses. While the larger
operators and firms usually handle the largest portion of the business volume, the quality and character of the tourism product depends on the diversity and services that the small tourism firms deliver. Second, small tourism firms are seen as a source of entrepreneurship and job creation, in particular, creating openings for the less privileged and less educated layers of society due to relatively lower entry barriers in terms of economic capital and/or education.

In addition to these two underlying understandings, the notion of small tourism businesses also admirably fits the ‘small is beautiful’ (Schumacher 1974) rhetoric that often is part of the promotion of alternative tourism, appropriate tourism, New Tourism, community tourism, or whatever label is affixed to alternatives to volume driven mass tourism (for example, Krippendorf 1987; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Murphy 1985; Poon 1993; Singh, Theuns and Go 1989).

However, these understandings are equally fitting for businesses and employment in the informal tourism sector. Here, too, the entry barriers are relatively low and entrepreneurial opportunities can be found for the less privileged and less educated. The informal sector businesses are often an important part of the tourism product diversity and are generally being run by individuals, families or social networks, and also often epitomise the ideology of small and local businesses. Yet, research into small tourism businesses far outstrips research into tourism and the informal sector. Not only is our research-based knowledge on the latter less and far from robust, when compared with many other tourism subjects, it also seems that the tourism related aspects of the informal sector are less studied than so many other areas of the informal sector. While far from robust evidence, it is nevertheless notable that a book search in the spring of 2005 on www.amazon.co.uk, using the key words ‘informal sector’, yielded 271 book titles, of which none had tourism as the main subject.

Globally, the informal sector activities servicing tourists are not confined to specific countries or regions. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suggest that the informal sector’s tourism businesses are particularly conspicuous in the developing countries that actively endeavour to develop international pleasure tourism. It is, therefore, noteworthy that in much of tourism planning in developing countries, the informal tourism sector is ignored, or even actively discouraged (Alipour 1996; Hampton 1998; Timothy and Wall 1997; Wilson 1997).

Not all types of tourists utilise the informal sector to the same degree. Simply stated, the less spatially active and the more organised and itinerary controlled the tourist is, the less the contact opportunities with informal sector operators. Conversely, the more flexible and the less pre-planned the tourist’s itinerary is, the higher is the need for, use of, and opportunities for the informal sector operators. Backpacker tourists, with their flexible itinerary, focus on budgeting, and low degree of pre-departure bookings (Sørensen 2003), epitomise such tourists. It is, therefore, equally noteworthy that this type of tourism has been ignored or even actively discouraged in much of tourism planning (Hampton 1998; Wilson 1997).

Thus, it seems worthwhile not only to supplement the extant literature on tourism and the informal sector, but also to supply the beginnings of a research critique. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to highlight the informal sector aspect of the tourism industry that, on
one hand, is all but neglected in much of official tourism planning and policy, and, on the other, is an all-important part of the tourism product in some places and among certain tourist types. A continuous ignorance of this sector and of these types of tourist–local interaction, not only ignores a much growing segment of contemporary and future tourism, but also, by this ignorance fails to identify problem areas with regard to the construction of less-than-desirable stereotypes of the destination among visitors.

**CONCEPTUALISING THE INFORMAL SECTOR**

Obviously, informal sector activities are not confined to matters connected with tourism only. On the contrary, it can be argued that the informal sector penetrates almost all spheres of economic activities—depending on how the informal sector is defined. And therein obviously lies a major problem that has repercussions within tourism research.

There is no universally recognised definition of the informal sector. To a large degree, the concept seems to be inspired by development studies of economic dualism, where a Western and modern sector is driven by capitalist economic motives, while a traditional, non-capitalist sector is driven by social and economic motives (for example, Boeke 1953). Timothy and Wall (1997: 322) trace the term ‘informal sector’ to the early 1970s, where it was used in the study of dual economic systems in Africa. Quoting Castells and Portes, they state: ‘...the informal economy is a process of income generation which is “unregulated by the institutions of society, in a legal and social environment in which similar activities are regulated.”’ (ibid.).

Citing an International Labour Organization (ILO) report from the 1970s, Kermath and Thomas (1992: 174) note that economic activities which are typically described by the term informal sector, are characterised by: easy entry, individual or family ownership, small-scale, labour intensive with non-formal training, small inventories, limited capital, and operations in unregulated and competitive markets. Koch and Massyn (2001: 159–60) categorise informal sector activities in the following four broad categories: trading and hawking, service industries, production and construction, and illegal activities.

It would be wrong, however, to perpetuate a dualistic view of distinct and unconnected economic sectors – formal and informal. Both Kermath and Thomas (1992: 177–78); and Timothy and Wall (1997: 323–24), cite a number of development studies, in which it is argued that these sectors can be mutually coexisting, and that an alternative to the ‘two-sectors perspective’ might be to view the economic system in developing countries as a continuum from the very informal to the very formal. One might add that an excessive use of the concept of ‘informal sector’ almost seems to formalise it by its very conceptualisation and this in itself might impede and constrain the comprehension of the diversity. On the other hand, however, one should be careful not to construct a picture of peaceful and cooperative coexistence. Rather, it is often a matter of coexistence, borne out of necessity, and fraught with conflict, in which
distinctions are accentuated, and in which formal sector operators almost always have the upper hand. Yet, many activities are not that easily classifiable, for instance, when informal sector operators serve as subcontractors for formal sector businesses, or when formal sector operators get involved in ‘black economy’ activities.

However, the latter also illustrates that a major distinction between formal and informal sector activities prevails, namely, that of official recognition. Thus, in many cases the informal sector can be characterised as economic activities that are not officially recognised by the government (Timothy and Wall 1997). Obviously, this cannot serve as a definition, but in terms of development planning and ideology, in particular as regards tourism development, it proves insightful. While in some cases it is a matter of ignoring the informal sector, in other cases, it is a matter of actively discouraging or physically removing the informal sector operators.

**THE INFORMAL SECTOR AND TOURISM**

Tourism development in developing countries supplies numerous examples of such attempts to control. To a large degree, this has to do with the fact, that economic activities in the informal sector are usually unregistered and unregulated, but also, it has to do with assumptions as regards to limited economic contribution, as well as assumptions, albeit often unsubstantiated, with regards to the presumed limited economic attractiveness of various visitor types.

The informal sector is rarely integrated in tourism planning or policy. Timothy and Wall state that, if considered at all, the informal sector is often viewed as a problem by tourism planners (Timothy and Wall 1997: 322), and other researchers have expressed similar concerns (Alipour 1996; Hampton 1998; Wilson 1997). Tellingly, in what arguably is the standard text book on the subject of tourism planning (Inskeep 1997), the informal sector is only mentioned in a few scattered sentences. This not-so-benign neglect may partly be caused by what Oppermann (1993: 552) contends, namely, that the development theories which are applied to tourism suffer from a focus on the formal sector and neglect of the informal sector. Nevertheless, only to a degree, does this explain the apparently widespread planning attitude towards the informal sector.

Oppermann (1993: 544) furthermore claims: ‘Given the higher integration of the informal tourism sector enterprises into the local economic structure, it is capable of producing a higher multiplier effect on the local economy than the formal tourism sector.’ However, it appears that, in general, governments in the developing countries exclusively focus their tourism development efforts on the formal sector. While this is hardly surprising, given the almost—by definition—unmanageability of the informal sector, the reason would nevertheless seem to go much beyond a matter of the impalpability of the informal sector. As already stated, several scholars have noted the negative view of tourism planning authorities towards the informal sector and these authors have experienced the same viewpoint in communications with tourism...
and development planners, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and international development organisations (none of these, incidentally, wanting to be identified). One planner explained that in island nations, he determinedly tried to plan out backpackers and other less organised tourists, attempting instead to replace them with high yield resort tourists, the assumption being that not only would these have a higher per day spending capacity and would be more controllable, but they would also, to a higher degree, be serviced by a taxable formal sector.

However, while one should not abstain from criticising contemporary tourism planning, one must extend the criticism to include tourism research in general. For, tourism research writings have only, to a limited degree, contributed to broaden our understanding of the informal sector in tourism. It is still a scantily researched subject area. Thus, any change in tourism planning with regard to incorporating the informal sector in the planning, has not found much assistance from tourism research. The limited amount of academic research into matters to do with the informal sector and tourism has not been enough; neither to cause an overall change of view of tourism planners towards the informal tourism sector, nor to substantiate the prevalent assumptions, and even less to develop more multifaceted and specific situational understandings of the informal sector in tourism.

To be fair, some research findings have indeed emerged. In a case study of gender and tourism in an Indonesian village, Wilkinson and Pratiwi (1995: 292), argue that tourism (in this case predominantly domestic) has opened up new employment opportunities for men and women, in both the formal and informal sectors. The same authors also warn that an upscale move of the tourism product is likely to cause a loss of jobs in the informal sector. Somewhat contrary to this viewpoint, Briassoulis (2002) raises a cautionary voice, arguing that development of the more informal dimensions of tourism and tourism businesses, precisely because of its uncontrollability, can be a serious issue as regards over-exploitation of common pool resources.

In another study, Alipour (1996: 376), criticising the lack of recognition of the informal sector in tourism planning in Turkey, notes, ‘the informal sector could have profound spatial and economic implications if it was incorporated into a planning strategy’. However, Alipour (ibid.) also questions the seemingly obvious parallel between informal sector businesses and non-volume driven tourism: ‘In fact, its characteristics are incongruent with the notion of “alternative”, “integrated” and “soft” or appropriate tourism.’ In other words, the existence of an informal sector in tourism cannot be explained solely by means of uni-evolutionary tourism development theory, like the much discussed tourism area life cycle model (Butler 1980). Here and elsewhere (for example, Kermath and Thomas 1992), informal sector businesses are seen as prevalent in the early stages of the development cycle, but being more and more marginalised as the cycle progresses towards more institutionalisation and volume; but it would be erroneous to interpret this as a decline in absolute terms. On the contrary, it would seem natural to assume that large areas of the informal tourism sector too are volume-dependent, and therefore, in a dependency relation to the economic health and viability of the formal sector.
Crick (1994: 159–93) supplies an in-depth and insightful description of the informal tourism sector in the town of Kandy, Sri Lanka. While the social structure, social dynamics, codes of conduct and informal sector *modus operandi* towards tourists obviously differs, many of the informal sector business tactics, communication and brokering techniques that Crick describes are similar to what the authors have observed and experienced in many tourism locations in developing countries. As Crick observes on international tourism in such countries (1994: 163), most relationships between locals and tourists are decidedly asymmetrical. Tourists, while possessing economic resources for consumption, possess only little local cultural capital, for example, in the shape of local language, price levels or local customs. Conversely, many locals lack in economic capital, but possess cultural capital that can be turned into economic gains through a multitude of trading or brokering interactions with tourists.

Oppermann (1993: 542) points out that for many hawkers, tourism demand is only supplementary to the main income source of local customers. While this is undoubtedly correct for many informal sector operators, the opposite would seem to be the case for other operators. Clearly, some types of informal sector operators are more involved in the tourism trade than others are; however, there does not seem to be any uniform line on this. Yet, some informal sector offerings, evidently, are solely for the tourist trade.

To clarify this matter, it is useful to follow Dahles’ (2000: 159–60) adaptation of Boissevain’s (1974) distinction between two types of small-scale entrepreneurs. Dahles distinguishes between ‘patrons’, who utilise means of production, such as, land, equipment, jobs, funds and specialised knowledge; and ‘brokers’, who act as intermediaries between the patrons and the tourists, and who have strategic contacts with other people who control resources. Dahles’ study, while being about tourism entrepreneurs, is not exclusively concerned with informal sector operators, but it does include these, and the distinction is useful. First, in a classificatory way, it clarifies the diversity of informal sector operators’ dependency on tourism. The tourist broker’s cultural capital, while useful when servicing tourists, cannot easily be shifted to other economic activities, thereby making it comparatively easier (albeit, often difficult) for patrons to diversify or to shift. Second, it improves the understanding of what happens when some types of tourists display a higher degree of demand for informal sector services, namely, the types of tourists whose trip is less fully organised, or whose demands are beyond the offerings of the formal sector. It is especially in such cases, that the brokering services of the informal sector will be needed, thereby encouraging contact with the entrepreneurs that ‘distinguish themselves by strategically operating networks instead of land, equipment, or funds’ (Dahles and Bras 1999: 274).

Thus, to summarise, the degree of organisation of the trip has several layers of impact on the interaction between tourist and informal sector. Not only does the degree of organisation or packaging influence the extend of interaction opportunities between tourist and informal sector operators at the destination, it also influences the kind and extent of services demanded by the tourist, as well as, the degree to which the informal sector services are at the core of the tourist experience. The case of backpacker tourism illustrates this point succinctly.
Backpacker Tourism

Backpacker tourists are arguably the most conspicuous and certainly a highly contested segment of tourist customers for informal sector offerings. The comparatively low degree of pre-departure organisation of the backpacker trip, combined with a relatively low degree of ‘local’ knowledge, and a need for budgeting because of extended travel time, not only impel the backpackers to utilise the services of small-scale patrons, it also make them an obvious target for brokers’ attempts to peddle services, knowledge and contacts.

While backpacker tourism is present all over the world, this study concentrates on countries in the developing world. According to Richter (1993: 185), Foreign Individual Travellers (FIT) (of which backpackers can be seen as a sub-segment) are at best tacitly ignored in South-East Asia’s official tourism planning, or at worst, development of this tourism sector is actively discouraged. Hampton (1998), in a study from the same part of the world, shares Richter’s understanding of the official viewpoint, and according to Crick (1994) and Wilson (1997), the same official viewpoint is prevalent in Sri Lanka and India, respectively. Recent studies of backpackers in Africa or South/Central America are quite scarce, but anecdotal evidence from guidebooks, backpackers and tourism planners, suggest a similar official viewpoint. It would seem that the authority viewpoint is founded in the assumption that backpacker tourism is not economically desirable, but if this indeed is the case, it is not based on much solid evidence, for, as Scheyvens (2002: 151) notes, the contribution of backpacker tourism to local development is hardly studied at all.

Another reason behind the official viewpoint might have to do with the hippie tourism of the 1960s and 1970s, which can be seen as the antecedents of present day backpacker tourism. Having had problems with hippie travellers, described by Cohen as ‘nomads from affluence’ (Cohen 1973), many developing countries tried to stem the influx of their successors and their ‘unruly’ tourism pursuits. However, as early as 1988, Riley stated that most backpackers (or budget travellers as she termed them) were not aimless drifters, societal misfits or drug addicts (Riley 1988: 326), and these findings have since been confirmed in several studies (for example, Desforges 1998; Errington and Gewertz 1989; Pryer 1997; Richards and Wilson 2004; Sørensen 1999, 2003).

In fact, contemporary backpackers are anything but nomads from affluence. On the contrary, they are generally well-to-do economically and well-educated (or on the way to becoming it). In general, they are (future) pillars of society, on temporary leave from affluent society, but with clear and unwavering intentions to return home to pick up their career or finish their education. The term ‘counter culture’, used on hippies and rebel youth groups, does not fit majority of the contemporary backpackers, whose rebellion at the most is connected to the opportunities that periods of self-elected liminality provides (Cohen 2003; Sørensen 2003). Thus, to perceive the backpackers as latter-day hippies is a gross misrepresentation; yet, in some ways, it is quite understandable, for, in outward appearance some backpackers do appear hippy-ish, with shabby clothing, long hair and somewhat unkempt appearance.
However, while the fact that backpacker tourism is so often ignored or frowned upon is conveniently explained by pointing towards economics, behaviour and looks, another quite simple reason should not be ignored, namely, the plain fact that contemporary backpackers are very difficult to define, conceptualise and quantify. While backpackers are typically described as young, self-organised, pleasure-travellers on a prolonged multiple destination journey with a flexible and loose itinerary, many backpackers do not in fact fully match this description. Some backpackers now set out with a starter kit consisting of air ticket, travel insurance, airport transfer and initial accommodation, and many backpackers purchase organised excursions and treks, while on the go. Some trips include working spells or voluntary work. The backpacker tour is now also undertaken within the framework of standard cyclical holidays, and seniors travelling the backpacker way are becoming a more and more common sight.

Paradoxically then, since backpackers in fact are such a motley crew that cannot be easily defined and quantified, they are susceptible to be appraised by means of the most conspicuous elements. This may well be the reason why backpackers are frowned upon by tourism planners and developing countries’ tourism authorities: a conspicuous minority is overshadowing the majority of relatively inconspicuous backpackers.

In addition to the above, the backpackers’ are also very diverse with regard to matters such as motivation, nationalities, and socio-demographics. Nevertheless, there are some factors that amount to common features. First, most backpackers travel on a budget, usually borne out of necessity, due to the extended length of the trip, which forces them to husband their financial resources. Second, most backpackers also travel with a flexible itinerary, subject to change: meaning that many services and facilities are not pre-arranged but will be booked when needed; something that marks them as potential customers for the informal sector patrons and brokers. Third, many backpackers’ behaviour are circumscribed by a backpackers’ travel culture, a road culture with norms, values, codes of conduct and status parameters (Riley 1988; Sørensen, 2003). A key cultural factor is the supposed ‘value for money’ and the ability to travel cheap, which not only brings peer recognition and reinforces the budgeting feature, but which also make them susceptible to informal sector offers. Fourth, backpackers are nomadic, in the sense that they travel around and visit multiple destinations; and though not completely footloose, they mostly follow well-defined routes—from backpacker destination to backpacker destination (Pryer 1997). Thus, while backpackers cannot easily be quantified, one can get an idea of patterns by looking at the development of backpacker gathering spots. These are found in many developing countries and while some date back to the days of the hippie travellers (for example, Goa in India, Kathmandu in Nepal, Kuta in Bali (Indonesia), or Lamu in Kenya), others appeared later on (for example, Koh Phangan, Thailand). In most cases, such backpacker hangouts now have a growing influx of package tourists and some of the backpackers avoid these places in favour of new and rising backpacker hot spots.

The rise of a backpacker hot spot may be based on a number of varied factors, such as, the presence of an attractive beach, remoteness, cultural attractiveness, perceived mystique and exoticism, or the availability of certain offerings, like, access to semi-legal drugs. However,
the most attractive feature of a backpacker hot spot is the other backpackers. Whether drugs, temples, beaches, culture or mountains are in the offering, it is the opportunities to socialise with other backpackers that primarily draw the backpackers to the hangouts. A key example of such a destination is Hampi, a ‘lost city’ in mainland India.

While tourists to Hampi are predominantly backpackers, most places where backpackers gather in large numbers also attract large volumes of other types of tourists. For instance, places like Varanasi in India, Chiang Mai in Thailand or Ubud in Bali (Indonesia) attract many backpackers. Yet, other types of foreign tourists exceed the backpackers, both in volume and conspicuousness. Nevertheless, the fact that backpackers tend to gather in hot spots means that there is sufficient volume of potential backpacker customers for the informal sector patrons and brokers to focus on this market.

**Backpackers and the Informal Sector: Examples from Puri, India**

Backpackers purchase a number of different goods and services from informal sector operatives, including lodgings in unregistered or under-declared accommodation, food and beverages from hawkers and street-side eateries, souvenirs and equipment from vendors, guiding, transport and other travel services, as well as access to cultural insights or illicit services (the latter spanning from after-hours alcohol purchase to drugs, currency exchange, prostitution and beach boys).

Puri—the holy city of the Hindus—in India provides many examples of interaction between backpackers and informal sector operatives, while at the same time demonstrating the complex context that this has to be understood in. It is beyond the scope of this paper to outline the heterogeneity of tourism to Puri. Therefore, what follows is not to be considered a case study, but is to be seen as evidence and exemplifications culled from recent ethnographic field notes. Therefore, it suffices to state that not only is Puri a major recipient of domestic Hindu religious travel (owing primarily to location of one of the four dhams—a must visit place for a devout Hindu to attain salvation), but is also a major holiday destination for domestic tourists, with one of the main attractions being the beach, albeit not beach tourism in the Western sense of the term. Although, the seaside as a source of leisure and recreation pastime is gaining popularity, particularly among the young Indians, it is still different from the diverse and complex ways of Westerners’ beach tourism.

In addition, Puri is also a stopping point for many foreign backpackers in India. While not one of the main circuits, Puri nevertheless does attract a number of backpackers and is an important destination in many backpackers’ India itinerary. However, according to local tourism officials, Puri is not a major recipient of other forms of foreign tourists. Non-domestic tourists are therefore, mostly of the backpacker kind. Other foreigners visiting Puri are often stationed at nearby Bhubaneswar, the capital of Orissa state, and come in conducted tours, on an itinerary that also covers another famous attraction close by, the Sun Temple at Konark, a World Heritage Monument.
Puri displays a marked distinction in the spatial location of accommodation catering to domestic holidaymakers and international backpackers, respectively. The distinction is by no means absolute, and it would be erroneous to describe it as segregation. Nevertheless, even casual observation quickly identifies the accommodation and service district of the predominantly foreign independent visitors (of whom most can be classified as backpackers, although quite a few would oppose such labelling).

To the Westerner’s eye, most shops and businesses in this district would probably be presumed to be ‘formal’, that is, registered or licensed, and thus, taxable. This, however, need not necessarily be the case. Not only that, even registered businesses may under-declare occupancy rates or turnover. A recent analysis by one of the editors of this volume, Sutheeshna Babu S, of Indian Institute of Tourism and Travel Management in Bhubaneswar, suggests that a significant share of the commercial accommodation in Puri is undeclared. Observations by this author also indicate that with regard to the part of the accommodation that caters to the foreign visitors, the negotiable pricing and the lack of receipt issuing leaves the door wide open for under-declaration of turnover.

While the above may be considered a matter of black economy rather than informal sector activities, such fiddles are found in the tourism service industry almost everywhere in the world. It is of importance, since it enables one of the most lucrative broker activities—that of commission making.

According to hoteliers in Puri, cycle- and auto-rickshaw drivers’ commissions for delivering a customer to a hotel regularly run as high as 50 per cent of the room rate—not just for the first night but for the total number of nights. The commission set-up is, of course, enabled by the fact that most backpackers arrive without pre-arranged accommodation. As it is, this is also the case for a number of domestic holidaymakers, but being much more price knowledgeable than even the most well-informed backpacker, the pricing elasticity of the domestic demand is much more limited, and the commission rates to the rickshaw driver, according to the hoteliers, is therefore significantly lower—between 5 and 10 per cent.

Usually, when backpackers arrive at the railway station in Puri, they are approached by rickshaw drivers, who offer to drive to a hotel for a nominal fee. If the first hotel is not to the satisfaction of the backpacker, they continue to the next, and so on, until the backpacker is accommodated. Ever so often, the backpacker ensures continuing business opportunities for the driver in terms of driving and guiding, which enables further commission income from the various shops and vendors that the backpacker visits while being piloted by the rickshaw driver. The backpackers are such a lucrative business potential, that their presence entices the cycle- and auto-rickshaw drivers with sufficient language proficiency to specialise on foreign customers.

The commission making of brokers is also present in other areas, such as, travel matters where the skilled broker can elicit both a fee from the tourist and a commission from the tour operator, or shopping, where guides habitually extract commission from the shops visited on a tour. In addition to the brokers, transport providers and guides, the backpacker district
also has its own informal sector retailers such as fruit sellers and craft vendors, and services providers such as masseurs or ayurvedic medicine advisers.

In summary, the backpacker district has its own informal sector entrepreneurs, such as rickshaw drivers, guides, fruit sellers and craft vendors, and some patrons with shops or hotels whose activities, on one hand, are based on a formal business but their business practices, on the other hand, overlap those of the informal sector. In addition to this, various illicit informal sector offerings such as after-hours alcohol, drugs and prostitution are available to the foreign customer, although it remains uncertain whether the suppliers cater exclusively to the foreign market. Even at the beach, predominantly a domestic tourism playground but with limited evidence of Western style beach life, the specialisation among informal sector operatives is evident. Certain craft vendors exclusively peddle their crafts to the foreign tourists, while on the other hand, the photo-op offer to mount a camel or a horse caters to a domestic market.

The above description of informal sector operations, catering to foreign backpackers in Puri, India, is but a scant outline. It does not describe the intricacies, complexities or challenges associated with informal sector operations, nor does it cover the policy or management challenges caused by their existence. It does describe, however, that the existence of a particular type of tourists, the foreign backpackers, sustain a distinct section of informal sector operators. It also demonstrates that the specialisation of the informal sector operators can be in terms of not only goods or services, but also skills and networks. The number of businesses and operators in Puri, depending on the backpacker segment, remains unclear, but for a number of enterprising operators, the previously described characteristics of the backpacker market create business opportunities and volume, which similar volumes of most other types of tourism probably cannot match. Thus, curtailment of inbound backpacker tourism to a popular area, whether by restrictions or pricing, is likely to wreak havoc on a large number of small-scale businesses, formal or informal, as described by Edensor (2004) in the case of Agra, India.

**CONCLUSION: TOWARDS BROADENING UNDERSTANDING**

In this chapter it has been argued that, on one hand, tourism planning has paid scant and derisory attention to the informal sector’s involvement in tourism, and, on the other hand, scholarly tourism research has not done much to instigate a revision of that standpoint, inasmuch as research on tourism and the informal sector is still very limited, both in scope and volume. Parallel to that, in working with international leisure tourism in developing world countries, both tourism planners and tourism researchers have focussed on highly organised and itinerary controlled tourism, while discounting the other tourists, whose tourism activities are less pre-booked and less itinerary controlled, which causes them to be in particular demand for informal sector offerings. Some tourists, more than others, solicit the services of the informal sector, and this has been illustrated by means of the case of backpacker tourism and some observations about backpacker tourism and the informal sector in Puri, India.
The case illustrates that it is difficult to distinguish sharply between informal sector operations and the more formal micro or small tourism enterprises due to the opportunities for undeclared economic transactions that tourism offers. But more fundamentally, however, it exemplifies a growth market, the self- or less-organised tourism market. With the growth in individual tourism, from within and outside, to developing countries, there is a growing demand for the network services that informal sector brokers can supply. For, while both the individual and the organised tourist are potential customers for the informal sector operatives, the individual tourist who organises things while on the go will naturally demand a wider range of informal sector services particularly in terms of the services that brokers offer.

However, the findings presented here also demonstrate the urgent need for further research into tourism and the informal sector. It is important to investigate the effects of legitimisation of informal sector operations. Timothy and Wall (1997) describe how tourist-focussed street vendors in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, have been legitimised and regulated by means of official vending licences, but it remains unclear whether this affects the business modus operandi, such as pricing strategy, touting and commission payouts. In other words, the businesses may now be formalised and licenced, but does this change anything from the point of view of the tourist? If this is not the case, then we have, in effect, a ‘seemingly informal sector’, where trading custom, physical set-up, and so on, resemble the unstructured, uncontrolled and unregulated appearance of the informal sector, but where, in fact, the individual hawking and vending is strictly regulated. Food courts in many Asian countries may leave such an impression in the mind of a first-time Western visitor and, while this may be a trite example, it nevertheless calls for the development of a more refined and varied conceptualisation of the informal sector, in order to have a deeper understanding of the consequences of regulatory activities.

It is also important to explore the operation and composition of various tourism-dependent informal sectors, at least in order to investigate what forms of informal regulation of the informal sector actually takes place, who work in informal tourism sector operations and how informal sectors income are made use of and distributed. On this we know next to nothing. Hitchcock’s study of ethnicity and tourism entrepreneurship in Java and Bali (Hitchcock 2000) asserts that many who work in the informal tourism sector are in fact migrant labour, and this author’s data from a number of developing countries suggest that this is common in the tourism catering informal sector, but what effect this may have on dispersal of income, inter-ethnic relations and destination image remains to be studied.

Obviously, it is important to conduct thorough economic analysis of tourism and the informal sector. Several authors (for example, Dahles 2000; Hampton 1998; Oppermann 1993; Scheyvens 2002; Wilson 1997) have argued that small-scale informal sector tourism activities may have a more beneficial local economic impact than formal large-scale activities; this may be in terms of broader distribution of income, improved trickle-down effect, less economic leakage, or local job creation. But these arguments, as the contrary arguments that informal sector and independent tourists cause sub-optimal utilisation of tourism resources, are very much based
on truism-like knowledge, superficial observations and unchallenged assumptions. Most likely, thorough economic studies will demonstrate that there are no simple truths and that the effects are very much dependent on specific socio-economic settings, but at least we will then have a more qualified basis on which to make planning and development decisions.

There is an even more basic argument for more research on tourism and the informal sector: no matter which planning ambitions are pursued, the forms of tourism that have a high demand for informal sector offerings have been growing rapidly in these years (Hyde and Lawson 2003; Sørensen 1999). Thus, to plan out those forms of tourism and to plan out the informal sector that service them, is to deliberately abstain from pursuing a growth market. Backpacker tourism may be an accentuated version of this tourism, but the backpacker phenomenon amply illustrates the pros and cons of catering to the Foreign Individual Tourists and the informal sector activities that arise in the wake of backpacker tourism. Policy wise, to ignore the backpackers and other Free Individual Tourists is to ignore a huge and growing tourism sector, and planning wise, to leave this sector and its adjacent informal sector operations to its own devices is to display a narrow tourism scope that neglects influencing the development direction of this tourism. Undeniably, there are less desirable effects arising from this less regulated tourism, but more research is needed on tourism and the informal sector in order to distinguish fact from prejudices.
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SECTION-B
TOURISM PRODUCTS, THE GAZE AND EXPERIENCES
In this chapter, we first analyse the recent evolution of rural tourism in Andalucía. For this purpose, we examine the demand side at macro level and descend to the municipality estimating transition matrices and bivariate densities to examine the dynamics of rural tourism supply. The relationship of rural tourism supply with per capita income is also investigated. The results of our analysis suggest a very significant growth of this emergent segment in almost every area of the region (not only in the less populated or economically depressed ones). Keeping in mind the importance of the tourism sector in Andalucía and the observed (positive and negative) experiences in the ‘sun–sea–sand’ segment during the last 40 years, we critically analyse the legal framework that regulates rural tourism. This includes a regional tourism law promulgated in 1999 and subsequent developments of it, some of them exclusively regulating the rural tourism segment. Finally, we analyse some recent experiences of rural tourism in developing countries and suggest some policy implications for these areas from our study of the recent evolution of rural tourism in Andalucía.

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1960s, the expansion of the tourism sector in Andalucía—the Southern region of Spain—has been remarkable with the number of visitors reaching 21.5 million by 2003 (57.5 per cent domestic and 42.5 per cent international). The importance of the tourism sector can be stated by its contribution to the regional gross domestic product (GDP): 13.5 per cent. During this period, tourism development was concentrated in the coastal areas, mainly in the Costa del Sol (8.5 million tourists in 2003).

Only in very recent years, rural tourism has experienced a significant growth in Andalucía, as well as in the whole country. The emergence of this tourism segment is seen—from private and public sectors—as an effective means of contributing to the economic, social and cultural
regeneration of the less populated and economically depressed areas of a region (Cánoves et al. 2004; Fleischer and Felsenstein 2000; Sharpley 2002; Yagüe 2002). Historically, Andalucía has been one of the less developed regions of Spain. In fact, recent figures confirm this argument. The estimate of per capita GDP for 2004 is 72 per cent of the EU–25 average (66 per cent of the former EU–15 average). But Andalucía also faces important inequalities within its territory between urban and rural areas, and between deep rural space and modern agricultural areas (Rodríguez Martínez 1999), yielding to a worse situation in some of it’s rural areas.

All stakeholders are conscious of the fact that the emergence of rural tourism segment in Andalucía is a unique opportunity. Several decades of mass tourism in the coasts of this region without coherent planning, in the context of practically permanent demand growth (Ivars Baidal 2004), resulted in a disordered growth, some irreparable natural damages, loss of profitability and a difficult challenge of maintaining quality. In contrast, rural tourism segment is beginning to expand, and now we have the experience of 40 years of mass tourism and a stronger scientific understanding of tourism than in the beginning of mass tourism development in Andalucía. Therefore, there is a certain consensus about the necessity of a clear and updated planning process, and a normative framework that may ease its development, in order to prevent the errors made in the past.

For these reasons, the regional government is very interested in promoting rural tourism, and has included it in it’s regional planning. However, the specific features of this tourism segment advise limiting its growth, in order to achieve an equilibrium between profitability and sustainability, according to the New Tourism model adopted in Spain, and to avoid many of the problems already detected in the sun–and–sea segment. Therefore, the normative framework must incorporate an adequate set of limitations, in order to guarantee the preservation and sustainability of natural and cultural environment. In Spain, regional governments are developing regional and sub-regional tourism planning instruments that are regulated in tourism laws. Andalucía, in particular, has recently promulgated a Law of Tourism and several other legal measures, some of them dedicated to rural tourism, which we critically analyse in the second part of this chapter.

Finally, recent experiences of rural tourism in some developing countries indicate that it is also an emergent tourist segment there. Keeping in mind that Andalucía is a peripheral European region, rural areas in Andalucía could be considered ‘doubly peripheral’, and hence, some policy implications from our analysis may be suggested for other less developed areas or countries, as we consider in the final section of this chapter.

**RECENT EVOLUTION OF RURAL TOURISM IN ANDALUCÍA**

The expansion of rural tourism is a phenomenon that came to Spain later, as compared to most of Europe. There are several reasons for this delay. One of them is that the depopulation of rural areas, from the mid 1950s to the 1980s, occurred later than in other industrialised
European countries (Cánoves et al. 2004). Only in the last 20 years, Spain has observed a significant growth of rural tourism segment. The number of rural houses in Spain increased from 1,074 houses in 1994 to 6,534 in 2003. This trend was also observed in Andalucía, but within a shorter available series. The number of registered rural lodging establishments in Andalucía was 316 in 2000 and 606 in 2003.

There are several factors that explain this notable growth of rural tourism in Andalucía in the last few years, mainly:

- the diversification of the tourism demand, that helps raise new tourist products, different from the traditional sun-and-sea one;
- the growing tendency towards splitting holiday periods—no longer concentrated entirely during the summer—and the preference for short distance travels (Yagüe 2002);
- the generalisation of models of regional development, that give incentive to economic and social policies oriented to redistributing incomes along the territories, including the supply of a specific tourist product for rural areas; and
- significant European funds dedicated to develop rural tourism projects (44 and 41 millions of euros, respectively, from programmes, Leader I and II).

From the demand point of view, there are two main statistical sources in Spain. On one hand, there is the national survey of occupancy in rural tourism lodgings driven by the Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE - National Statistics Institute). This source studies the rates of occupancy in rural lodgings, as they are defined in the legislation of every autonomous region. On the other hand, the Familitur survey, driven by the Institute of Tourism Studies (IET), which investigates the tourism pattern of the Spanish households, reports the domestic travellers as the main consumers of the rural tourism product in Spain (83 per cent of the overnights recorded in rural lodgings in Spain corresponded to domestic travels in 2003).

According to Familitur data, in 2003, there were 1.3 million domestic tourist travels to rural houses in Spain, and 19.5 per cent of them correspond to Andalucía. But most important, if we go back to 2000, the first available year of this series, the growth rate in 2000–03 was 115 per cent in Andalucía, while the national growth rate was 50 per cent. Therefore, the market share is increasing in Andalucía (see IET, several issues).

The figures of the INE also show a very important growth of the sector, greater in Andalucía than in the whole country, although not as impressive as the Familitur one. Figure 7.1 shows the monthly series of rural overnights since the beginning of the survey in 2001. In spite of the strong seasonality of the series, the significant expansion of the sector can be seen.

Looking at the supply-side, in order to get a deeper insight, we adopted a municipal level of geographical disaggregation in our analysis. The geographical distribution of bedspaces in 2000 and 2003 is shown in Maps 7.1 and 7.2. It can be seen that the rural tourism segment is spreading along the territory at a high rate.
Figure 7.1  Rural Tourism Demand in Spain and Andalucía (Over Nights)

Source: INE several issues.

Map 7.1  Bedspaces in Rural Houses by Municipalities, 2000

To study the dynamics of this phenomenon, we have estimated a transition matrix (Table 7.1) with the available data of the last four years for the variable bedspaces in rural lodgings at a municipal level. To do this, we have classified each year the municipalities into five categories or states: (no bedspaces), (1 to 8 bedspaces), (9 to 12 bedspaces), (13 to 20 bedspaces) and (21 and more bedspaces). The values of the transition matrix indicate the estimated probabilities of a municipality moving from the state represented by the row in 2000 to any of the states represented in columns in 2003.

For example, the estimated probability that a municipality without rural tourism lodgings in 2000 (state 1: 0 bedspaces) continues in this state in 2003 is 0.86. Therefore, the probability of this municipality being included in 2003 in the sector of rural tourism lodgings (states 2, 3, 4 and 5) is the sum of rest of the elements of the first row of the matrix, $0.04 + 0.05 + 0.03 + 0.02 = 0.14$. This is a high probability, keeping in mind that the change occurs in only three years.
The highest estimated probabilities of the municipalities starting at states 2 and 3 are those of permanence in the same state, 0.60 and 0.88, respectively. But apart from these ones, they exhibit higher probabilities of transiting to states of more bedspaces than to states of less bedspaces.

Focussing our attention in the states 4 and 5, we find that the municipalities starting at state 4 exhibit a higher probability of entering state 5 (0.53), than of staying in the same state (0.31). And those in state 5 show a very high probability of permanence (0.96).

The main results reveal that in the observed period:

- the municipalities without rural tourism lodgings at the beginning show a significant probability (0.14) of exiting this state and beginning to offer this tourism segment within the observed period; and
- the municipalities that began with any bedspaces rarely decreased their level or state (the estimated probabilities at the left of the main diagonal of the transition matrix are very small) and generally maintained it or increased it.

Concluding the analysis of the transition matrix, it is necessary to mention that the estimated probabilities cannot be considered predictive. These probabilities show what would happen if the observed dynamics were exactly reproduced in the future. Therefore, they can only be considered as approximations of the observed dynamics and their predictive validity is conditioned to the permanence of the observed structures.

In order to avoid the main methodological limitation of the transition matrices (it is necessary to define discrete states, which may condition the results), we have also estimated a bivariate stochastic kernel. The bivariate density estimate can be considered as a continuous version of the transition matrix, where the variable is treated as a continuous one, and it is unnecessary to divide it into intervals or states. The estimation method we have adopted uses a Gaussian kernel and the optimal bandwidth proposed by Silverman (1986).
Figure 7.2 exhibits the bivariate density, estimated only for municipalities with rural bedspaces in 2000, in order to avoid scale problems in the graphics. This figure confirms the results of the analysis of the transition matrix. The majority of the municipalities are still in a state of low number of places, as the modes are near the origin. However, there are also density masses far from the origin, with number of places higher than 50, even 80. In addition, these points are located at an angle greater than 45° indicating increasing dynamics.

Figure 7.2  Rural Tourism Bedspaces Dynamics in Andalucía: Non-Parametric Bivariate Density, 2000–03

Source: Density estimated with data from IEA (2004).

Keeping in mind that rural tourism is encouraged by the public sector for the revitalisation of rural areas, we have also analysed the relationship between per capita income and the number of rural accommodation establishments in the municipalities of Andalucía. The statistical source for the per capita income at the municipal level is La Caixa (2001). In this study, the municipalities of Spain, with more than 1,000 inhabitants, are classified into seven intervals of per capita household disposable income. We have classified the municipalities with less than 1,000 inhabitants into the interval ‘...’, denoting that we have no information about their level of per capita income, although most of them may possibly be classified into the lower intervals.
To analyse the relationship between per capita income and rural tourism supply, we have estimated two contingency tables (Tables 7.2 and 7.3). These tables show a certain degree of association but it is important to notice that the highest percentages of municipalities with rural tourism supply correspond to the ones in the third (34.2 per cent) and fourth (30.4 per cent) intervals of per capita income (in an increasing scale of seven intervals) in 2003, and to the second (16.2 per cent) and third (21.9 per cent) intervals in 2000.

### Table 7.2 Distribution of Municipalities by Per Capita Income and Number of Rural Lodging Establishments, 2000

| Number of rural lodging establishments | Per capita income level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                                       | 0  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  |
| 0                                     | 16184.7      | 10985.2 | 15583.8 | 8978.1 | 3984.8 | 3589.7 | 7100.0 | 1100.0 |
| 1                                     | 168.4        | 129.4   | 126.5    | 108.8   | 36.5    | 37.7   | 0.0   | 0.0 |
| 2                                     | 52.6         | 21.6    | 84.3     | 43.5    | 24.3    | 12.6   | 0.0   | 0.0 |
| 3                                     | 10.5         | 10.8    | 31.6     | 32.6    | 0.0     | 0.0    | 0.0   | 0.0 |
| 4                                     | 42.1         | 0.0     | 21.1     | 43.5    | 0.0     | 0.0    | 0.0   | 0.0 |
| 5 and more                            | 31.6         | 43.1    | 52.7     | 43.5    | 24.3    | 0.0    | 0.0   | 0.0 |

Source: Own elaboration with data from IEA (2004) and La Caixa (2001).

### Table 7.3 Distribution of Municipalities by Per Capita Income and Number of Rural Lodging Establishments, 2003

| Number of rural lodging establishments | Per capita income level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                                       | 0  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  |
| 0                                     | 14475.8      | 9372.7  | 13271.4 | 7565.8 | 3269.6 | 3487.2 | 685.7 | 0.0 |
| 1                                     | 2111.1       | 2116.4  | 2413.0  | 1513.2 | 817.4  | 410.3  | 114.3 | 0.0 |
| 2                                     | 84.2         | 43.1    | 84.3    | 97.9   | 24.3   | 0.0    | 0.0   | 1100.0 |
| 3                                     | 63.2         | 21.6    | 31.6    | 54.4   | 12.2   | 0.0    | 0.0   | 0.0 |
| 4                                     | 42.1         | 32.3    | 63.2    | 10.9   | 12.2   | 0.0    | 0.0   | 0.0 |
| 5 and more                            | 73.7         | 32.3    | 115.9   | 76.1   | 24.3   | 12.6   | 0.0   | 0.0 |

Source: Own elaboration with data from IEA (2004) and La Caixa (2001).

The $\chi^2$ test, which is the most common statistical procedure to test if there is a statistically significant degree of association between the two variables in a contingency table, is non-significant in both Tables 7.2 and 7.3 at the usual significance level of 5 per cent, thus indicating that the slightly observed degree of relationship between the number of rural lodging establishments and per capita income level is not statistically significant. We have also...
recalculated the test with several alternative aggregations of the variables (to avoid cells with low or null frequencies that can affect the outcomes of the test) and obtained the same results.

In general, there has been an increment in the number of municipalities in all the intervals of per capita income, including those in the lower levels. Then, the recent growth pattern of rural tourism in the region emerges very interesting. While it stands witness to a fast growth in the demand-supply scenario of rural tourism, the spread is also taking place quickly in the whole region. However, this trend is relatively higher in those municipalities in the lower per capita income levels, followed by those in the intermediate level. This growth patterns, indeed, pose many challenges and is necessary to establish adequate measures to mediate the growth and maintain standards.

**RECENT REGULATION ON RURAL TOURISM IN ANDALUCÍA**

Andalucía is one of the 17 autonomous communities that form Spain. The territorial organisation of Spain resulting from the 1978 Spanish Constitution gave extensive legislative powers to the autonomous communities, including legislation about tourism. Since then, tourism planning is mainly based on a regional scale, being the autonomous community, the *a priori* tourist region (Ivars 2004). All these communities approved their own tourism laws, which revised and adapted the national regulations to suit their own needs. The Law of Tourism of Andalucía was approved in 1999 and it was followed by a general tourism plan for the region in 2001 (*Plan General de Turismo de Andalucía*) and a rural tourism plan (*Plan Senda*) in 2002.

But, it was not until 2002 that a specific Act was entirely dedicated to rural tourism in Andalucía (*Decreto 20/2002*).

As several authors agree, the public sector intervention is even more critical in the rural tourism segment than in the general one (Mediano and Zorrilla 2003). There are many ways to interact with the sector, like supply-side incentives (credits and economic support for new activities), and instructions improving human capital. However, from a sustainability point of view, the main tool is legal regulation. Public administrations may establish a legal framework that regulates the sector activity in a clear way and guarantees an equilibrated and respectful growth of it. The main, positive aspects of normative regulation on rural tourism are:

- It allows the categorisation of the supply and helps in improving the market transparency;
- It can improve quality standards, by means of inspection and control systems, which definitely benefit rural tourists; and
- It can establish a limiting framework to avoid disordered growth.

The most recent legislation regarding rural tourism in Andalucía is oriented to these objectives. The Acts 20/2002 and 47/2004 (*Decreto 20/2002; Decreto 47/2004*), that develop...
the Law of Tourism of Andalucía (Ley 12/1999) are the latest additions to this emerging regulation in Andalucía. The Act 20/2002, is the most important as it regulates many aspects of rural and active tourism. First, it gives a detailed categorisation of the accommodation supply in the rural areas:

(i) Rural lodging establishments:
- Rural houses
- Rural hotels and rural tourist apartments
- Rural tourist complexes
- Other rural lodging establishments

(ii) Rural lodging dwellings (private dwellings used for tourist lodging)

In addition, this rule allows the specialisation of the establishments into 12 specialities, which include forest houses, cave-houses, refuges and such others. Each category and speciality is defined by a series of minimum and complementary standards, services and infrastructures.

On the other hand, Act 20/2002 imposes several limits to the capacity of the rural lodging establishments and dwellings. For example, rural houses and rural lodging dwellings will have no more than 20 bedspaces and three buildings. A maximum number, that is 250, of bedspaces is also established for rural hotels and rural tourist apartments.

The Act 20/2002 also includes a complete title dedicated to active tourism. This feature is important because it seems that public authorities in Andalucía are leaving the stage mentioned by Blanquer (1999)—consisting of a one-dimensional regulation focussed in lodging—and entering a new stage which demands regulation on other public interests concerning active tourism, environment conservation, human capital, and so on. This title regulates 33 activities of active tourism, mainly carried out in rural areas, defining many aspects of the firms that will provide these activities: number and qualification of monitors, required resources, and so on.

After a detailed analysis of the rural tourism legislation in Andalucía, we can summarise the main problems it has to face in the near future as:

- There is excessive emphasis on the accommodation aspects of rural tourism and the regulation of many other aspects, like environmental, educational, or promotional ones, is needed.
- The classification of rural accommodations in five types, with 12 possible specialities is rather large and somewhat confusing. In addition, there are many other different classifications in the rest of Spanish regions (Cánoves et al. 2004). This imposes many difficulties in the commercialisation and marketing tasks, as it could lead to considerable confusion among potential consumers. Therefore, it is essential to establish coordination...
mechanisms among different administrations (regional, national and local), in order to achieve a somewhat unified (or at least compatible) classification.

- Andalucía has established a particular system of quality certification. Now there are many different category systems in Spanish regions, using symbols like shells, apples, stars, and so on. It is necessary to unify them or at least to coordinate them.
- The legal system adopted in Andalucía, as well as in the rest of Spain, is heavily based on a complex administrative process. This slows down the tourism planning processes and limits the development of efficient legal instruments.
- At the same time, most efforts are oriented to legal developments, paying less attention to the fulfillment of tourism regulation through control, inspection and punishment mechanisms that guarantee quality standards.

RURAL TOURISM IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Tourism, in general, is a sector that can stimulate development. Although we don’t consider that it is a universal solution to all the difficulties of the developing countries, we agree with other authors that tourism has many positive effects on development. Among others, Wahab (1997) mentioned that tourism:

- creates new local requirements for equipment, food and other supplies fostering new industries and commercial activities and creating a new market for them;
- has a favourable impact upon employment;
- increases urbanisation through the continuous growth, construction and renovation of tourist facilities;
- helps to increase the state earnings of hard currency necessary for bridging or reducing whatever deficit there is in the balance of payments;
- is one of the most effective redistributive factors in international economic relations; and
- activates the economic circuit in a country, thus accelerating the multiplier effect.

But, we cannot forget the other side. The negative impacts of tourism in developing countries may include dependence on imports, distortion of the national value system, vandalism, congestion, increased crime and the possible change or loss of the national architectural heritage and natural beauty Wahab (1997).

Rural tourism, in particular, can contribute to economic growth, heritage conservation and enhancement, and achievement of a higher standard of living for the inhabitants of rural areas. It can foster the creation of opportunities for local development through job creation and local projects for the conservation of animal species, plants or biodiversity in general. Heritage (in a broad sense, including natural and cultural elements) can be a strategic resource for the
socio-economic development of local people, as in many cases it represents the basic component of rural tourism that drives and sustains small- and medium-sized enterprises. This is the reason why tourism’s multiplier effect has a positive influence on the different sectors of regional economies.

As Briedenhann and Wickens (2004) mention, governments are generally of the opinion that tourism development will generate new jobs, enhance community infrastructure and assist in revitalising the economies of rural areas. Moreover, especially in rural areas, tourism is often seen as the preferred development option, where the lack of other options leads to no consideration of possible or future negative effects.

Rural tourism can also stimulate greater environmental awareness and instil a stronger sense of pride among residents, when they see tourists enjoying their own historical, cultural and natural heritage.

However, not all the effects of tourism on rural areas are positive. For example, we can cite the paucity of revenues, the inequity of benefit distribution and the perceived social costs to resident communities (Briedenhann and Wickens 2004). Moreover, government subsidies may be required to maintain the sector and local communities may be not able to perform effective marketing (Sharpley 2002).

Focussing on the demand side, as several authors have pointed out (Page and Getz 1997; Sharpley and Sharpley 1997), the recent trends in tourism lead to a shift from standardised mass tourism to more individualistic patterns, which look for a more meaningful experience. In this sense, the emergent rural tourist segment has varied motivations, which might include ecological uniqueness, cultural attractions, special adventures opportunities, or the peace and quiet of the countryside. This presents a unique opportunity for rural operators, who can establish networks of different service providers to maximise opportunity and offer a diverse range of activities (Briedenhann and Wickens 2004).

In a recent study, the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO 2003 in the Americas) predicts a significant potential of growth of this sector within the next few years. The report suggests that, for the analysed countries (Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and the Dominican Republic), greater efforts should be made by government sectors to improve the profitability of rural development, rather than develop it.

Argentina, Chile and Mexico are the only countries in the Americas which are implementing official programmes in support of rural tourism development. The main goals of these activities are to meet the demand for promotion, training and technical assistance. In other countries, actions are being taken within a more general framework of official programmes. There is also the Programme in Support of Rural Micro-enterprises in Latin America and the Caribbean, which aims to develop rural tourism in Latin America and Central America.

The data shows the importance of domestic market in each of the analysed countries. In Brazil, Mexico and Argentina, it accounts more than 90 per cent of the customers. In Chile, Paraguay, Panama, Uruguay and Dominican Republic, the figures vary between 60 per cent and 75 per cent. In addition, the North American market is very important for destinations
such as Mexico, Chile and Panama. For other countries, the main international sources are countries within the region (Latin America), followed by Europe and Japan.

The conclusions of the UNWTO report indicate that rural tourism in Latin America is most competitive when carried out by rural families themselves. Since most businesses are small- and medium-sized, receipts are limited as compared to those of traditional hotels, but in comparison with those of agriculture, they are significant. It is important to notice that the most important structural difference between the agricultural sector in developed countries and in Latin America lies in subsidy policies. Production systems within the Latin American sector are not subsidised, unlike those in the US and the EU (UNWTO 2003). This can be extended to most of the developing countries.

**CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Having analysed the recent evolution of rural tourism in Andalucía, five principal conclusions are drawn:

- Rural tourism is growing at significant rates in Andalucía, and it is expanding along the inland areas of the whole region. This development will continue in the coming years.
- In order to get a transparent market for investors and customers, the existence of a clear normative regulation is essential. The coordination of the legal framework with neighbouring regions is also especially important.
- Having seen the disordered growth of mass tourism in the coasts of Andalucía, which currently results in significant reduction in the profitability of this segment, public and private sectors are conscious of the necessity of preventing this error in the emergent segment of rural tourism. Therefore, it is required to impose limits before it is too late.
- Policies for developing human capital are still the most urgent and necessary ones in this sector. Until now, the regional and local governments have focussed their activities in administrative regulation, but active policies oriented towards the training of local manpower are also required to achieve a significant development of rural tourism.
- Tourism planning must be truly oriented to find the equilibrium between sustainability and profitability. The paradigm of sustainability has settled vigorously in the political discourse, but hardly leads to specific achievements.

Although these conclusions have been obtained from a particular European region, Andalucía, some policy implications may be suggested for other less developed areas or countries.

First, rural tourism appears to be a better option than mass tourism for the development of economically depressed areas, as the required dimension of businesses allows rural population to enter in the sector. This facilitates the participation of local communities in sharing benefits and decision-making (Tosun 2004).
Second, domestic market dominates rural tourism in Andalucía, as it occurs in many developing countries. Therefore, in order to attract international tourists for this segment, the positioning of the product in the international market would be strengthened by the coordination of promotion amongst the different regions or even countries. The public sector may help in the development of this sector through promotion, marketing and research into markets and trends.

Third, due to the special characteristics of the natural and social environment in which rural tourism takes place, it is necessary to protect it and to guarantee the future sustainability of the sector through the establishment of an adequate and effective legal framework, before a disordered growth with irreversible consequences occurs. It is also very important that the legal framework does not impose complex administrative processes that slow down the development of rural tourism, and that a certain degree of coordination with neighbouring regions or countries exists.

Fourth, the role of public sector must not be limited to normative regulation. Although the existence of a legal framework is a very important contribution, the studied case in Andalucía, as well as other case studies in peripheral areas and developing countries, suggest that active policies, like promotion, training, institutional reinforcement and marketing are essential for a development of rural tourism.
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Tourism to an island, like that to any area, is not free from problems. Problems could become relatively extreme, given the limited scale of the island setting. Environmental degradation, conflict between locals and visitors, excessive demand on consumables from electricity to water, commodification and distortion of customs from agricultural systems to cultural activities, all are common. There is also the problem of leakage, with much of the money spent on or in transit to the island, repatriated by tourism companies based off-island. However, with regard to other economic sectors, islands face difficulties not shared by mainlands: of small scale, scarcity and/or restricted range of resources, limited size and/or skills of the labour force and expensive transport costs associated with peripherality and, usually, remoteness. These issues make islands less competitive than mainlands. So, despite bringing problems in its trail, tourism has become a lifeline to many small islands, given that it provides money without the need for production on the island. Tourists bring cash earned elsewhere and hand it over for services and consumables (which can be imported), often inferior to what they have or buy at home, just for the sake of their being removed from everyday activities: the magic of being ‘on holiday’. In the limiting case, the island might provide little more than the space, often just a littoral, where holiday activities are based (Royle 2001: Chapter 9).

**‘Mainland Islands’: Islands as Offshore Mainland Destinations**

Island tourism takes different forms, depending on regional rather than local circumstances. Take Spain for example. For decades, it has been a part of the European tourism core. Its Mediterranean coast is divided into the famous ‘Costas’—Costa Blanca, Costa Brava, Costal del Sol, Costa Dorado—littoral strips served by major airports (Map 8.1).

Foreigners—tourists on holiday, villa owners, retirees—arrive in millions and participate in activities characteristic of their nationality, age group and wealth/status. Some will sit on the beach in daylight and in a bar in the evenings; some will interact with local culture—an
evening of local dancing, or a bullfight. There might be visits to historic cities. Spain’s major holiday islands do not differ essentially from this pattern, even though tourism is of greater significance to their economies than is the case for mainland areas, which would normally have a greater range of economic activity. Functionally, there is no distinction in tourists from Stockholm or Belfast if their charter lands at Alicante on the Costa Blanca or at Palma de Mallorca on the Balearic island of Mallorca. Both holiday destinations offer beaches, bars, excellent food, golf courses, historic cities and fine scenery. The different Balearic Islands focus on distinct market sectors: Ibiza is famous for its club scene and is a magnet for young singles; Menorca is much quieter and patronised by people, often families, seeking a more peaceful time; Mallorca, the biggest island, offers a range of accommodation and holiday types, from the club scene of resorts such as Palma Nova to hiking and cycling holidays—its roads in spring are clogged with club cyclists from all over Europe (Figure 8.1). But mainland areas also offer similar ranges of resort types and activities (http://www.skytravel.co.uk/). This is not to imply
that Mallorca is identical to the mainland. Its history is bound up with Spain, but there were Kings of Mallorca in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. And although Palma de Mallorca is already capital of Baleares, the autonomous region comprising the Balearic Islands, there are political parties pressing for regained independence. The author has photographs of graffiti screaming in the local language, ‘We are not Spanish’. Mallorca’s separateness has donated distinctiveness to its culture, from pottery to language to cuisine. But that does not necessarily make its holiday product distinct.

**Figure 8.1 Tourism in Mallorca**

A similar story could be told of other island groups. In regions where there is a major tourism industry, that has impacts, too, on neighbouring continents such as the Mexican and other Central American resorts in association with those of nearby Caribbean islands. Thus, a western Caribbean cruise might visit Guatemala, Honduras and Belize, as well as the Cayman Islands, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica. An Asian example would be Thailand, once beyond the pleasure periphery for Europeans, but now a commonplace destination, as confirmed horrifically in the deaths of thousands of Europeans in the December 2004 tsunami. Some take dedicated trips to island resorts, but large numbers of Thailand’s tourists comprise independent travellers, who would go to Bangkok and Chang Mai on the mainland, and perhaps also take in Phi Phi, Phuket and the Similan Islands. Thus, to many foreigners,
their destination is ‘Thailand’, which may involve trips to islands or ‘Spain’, where whether the resort be Benidorm on the Costa Blanca or Puerto Pollensa on Mallorca probably matters little to most trippers. Thus, there are islands that might be dubbed ‘mainland islands’, which are established parts of a tourism region and which operate in association with or similar to neighbouring continental resort locations.

**‘ENTRY ISLANDS’: ISLANDS AS NEW PLAYERS IN TOURISM**

Remote islands can become important players in global tourism; Mauritius and the Maldives are examples. Their isolation has had an effect; presumably if Mauritius and the Maldives had a location equivalent to the Bahamas, their entry into tourism would have been earlier and easier. However, with long haul travel spreading the pleasure periphery, these islands have now become global tourist destinations. Other islands remain not just outside core areas, but on the edge of, perhaps beyond, the pleasure periphery. The economic attractions of tourism are apparent to such islands’ entrepreneurs and authorities, but their problem is that they struggle to establish market share because of a lack of recognition or limited infrastructure, from accommodation to delivery mechanisms. Often, there is not a convenient mainland with which to share economies of scale and marketing. Perhaps there is a lack of comparative advantage combined with problems of intervening opportunities. Why would a tourist travel the world at great expense to a small, remote island when there are other established, well-founded places, which are cheaper and more convenient? Add to it the fact that some of these islands have cool, even cold, climates and their difficulties may be compounded (Baldacchino 2006). Such islands, let us call them ‘entry islands’, have come late to the feast, but there is evidence that some are now beginning to gather up a few crumbs which, given their scale, is all they need to establish a locally worthwhile tourism sector.

The ‘entry islands’ that will be discussed here are St. Helena, Easter Island (Rapa Nui) and the Falkland Islands, all of which were visited by the author in 2004 (Map 8.2). Their populations are tiny: 4,000 or less, although that of the Falkland Islands is spread over a substantial land area. They are isolated. The Falklands are closest to a mainland, but given that it is Argentina and there are few links with the country following the 1982 invasion, the functional isolation is greater than the isolation suggested by the physical distance. The Falklands link instead with Chile on the opposite coast of Latin America. None of them enjoy political independence: Easter Island is part of Chile; the others are Overseas Territories of the UK. They are all difficult to access. Easter Island is served by a twice-a-week flight from Santiago, which goes on to French Polynesia. The cost is high and this isolates the island from many segments of the tourism market. The Falkland Islands can be reached with the British Royal Air Force via Ascension Island or, more easily, on a weekly flight from Punta Arenas in southern Chile, which connects to Santiago. The capacity is limited the periodicity restricts the market and tourists
can only come for week blocks, and given that most will spend some time to get to Santiago, going to the Falklands needs the length of time of an annual holiday and the islands cannot participate in the short break market.

Map 8.2 St. Helena, Easter Island and the Falkland Islands

The limiting case is St. Helena. There have been plans for years to build an airport and finally in March 2005, it was announced that the decision had been taken. Presently and until 2010, when the airport is scheduled to begin operations, access is limited to the government ship, RMS St. Helena which used to ply the Atlantic from the UK to Cape Town to service the island. Now it remains in the South Atlantic with passengers having to fly to Ascension Island, Namibia or South Africa to take the ship. The operation of the ship is heavily subsidised,
but inevitably, having to spend days aboard is expensive and the time needed again means that a tourist trip to St. Helena has to be an annual holiday or the passenger has to be a retired person. Thus the market is restricted.

These ‘entry islands’ strive to improve access to help their tourism. St. Helena is presently suffering from considerable out-migration, has a weak domestic economy and is the only British Overseas Territory that requires budgetary aid. The only way forward, if St. Helena is to have a future outside of being a subsidised retirement home for its old folks, is to build the airport despite its cost, which is known to be high but which has not been released into the public domain for commercial reasons. The airport will open up the island for an absolutely small but relatively significant tourist trade, which could transform it economically, perhaps, at a cost of irrevocable social change. The present open, friendly and virtually crime-free society might be at risk if visitors increased from a few hundreds a year to thousands. Without an airstrip, the best that can be done, and it has been done, is to juggle the scheduling of RMS St. Helena to increase calls (http://www.rms-st-helena.com/), but the fact that St. Helena is days’ steaming from anywhere, even two days from Ascension Island, the closest land, means that without an airstrip, access can only ever be occasional and expensive.

On the Falkland Islands, the way forward is seen as establishing a second, midweek flight per week to Chile, which would make tourism more flexible. However, given that the Chile route traverses Argentine air space, permission from that government is needed and that has not yet been forthcoming.

These islands also participate in the cruise market. Even Easter Island, 3,700 km off Chile and the most isolated landmass in the world, has cruises—one agency listed 14 in the year from January 2005—mostly calling at Easter Island and French Polynesia (http://www.choosingcruising.co.uk/). However, isolation might be a disincentive, with many more days spent on the empty ocean than would be the case with, say, Caribbean cruises. Similarly, whilst there are a few Atlantic cruises that call at St. Helena (http://www.cruisecompete.com/) and even QE II has anchored off in Jamestown, its isolation means that such visits are never going to be frequent enough to make a substantial difference to the economy. The Falklands are different as they participate in both Latin American and Antarctic cruises (Ingham and Summers 2002). In the 2004–05 season, 39 ships were scheduled to make 85 voyages to the islands. The considerable majority of Falklands’ tourists arrive by ship; almost 35,000 in 2003–04 as opposed to a few hundred by air. To some extent, Falklands cruising capitalises on a captive market. Ships going round Latin America call anyway and one wonders whether the motivation for most passengers is to see Rio de Janeiro or Stanley. For those going south, the Falklands are the last port of call with a commercial economy where purchases can be made, including by the ships, many of which stock up with fresh vegetables. The cruise ships also usually make another stop in the islands in addition to Stanley, and passengers get the chance to see something of the history and wildlife. Land-based operations for the Falklands cruise market are well organised, even if some find challenging, the off-road driving experience which is necessary to access most wildlife sites. Island companies market these trips as ‘safaris’ (Royle 2006).
Let us consider how these ‘entry islands’ attract people specifically to choose them for holidays. Mallorca will now be greeting tourists whose grandparents went in the 1950s when mass tourism started. Every travel agent in northern Europe sells package holidays for Mallorca. Typing ‘Mallorca holidays’ into a search engine revealed precisely 5,00,000 results in January 2005. There is huge infrastructure, established links, old traditions, and even if many go only for a short break, on a low cost airline, go they do: 20 million passengers went through Palma airport in 2004. The ‘entry islands’ have no such traditions and also weak infrastructure. They cannot ever appeal to the mass market, like Mallorca. Their only strategy is to establish a niche, capitalising on whatever nature or history has bequeathed.

Take, for example, Easter Island and its statues. Polynesians arrived c. 400 AD, established various clans and territories on the island and developed worship focussed around the *moai*, the torsos representing sacred chiefs, erected on *ahu*, or altars, usually on coastal sites. At the end of the *moai* period, sometime before the Europeans first arrived in 1722, environmental degradation—associated with population growth and deforestation, with many trees probably being used as rollers for the statues—led to warfare, during which the *moai* were tumbled. Today, the island has some agriculture and is also strategically placed, the only land for thousands of square kilometres. It is a naval base with rescue services and its airstrip was extended to make it available for space shuttles in emergency. But mostly the economy is tourism-based, with total visitor numbers exceeding 20,000 per annum by the late 1990s (http://www.islandheritage.org/tourism.html). What has this incredibly isolated place to offer? The *moai*. Many have been re-erected, but are worshipped now not by islanders, but by tourists. The sites are well-cared-for and not over–controlled; the quarry at Rano Raraku, where all the *moai* were carved, is splendidly open for exploration (see Figures 8.2 and 8.3). There are restaurants, beaches and hotels, but the *moai* are the island’s icon. Everywhere there are models, many islanders make a living from carving and selling them in shops and handicraft markets in the main settlement of Hanga Roa. And which market segment is attracted by medieval stone torsos? Middle-aged, educated and wealthy. That is the niche.

St. Helena’s icon is—or will be if its access is improved—Napoleon, using Napoleon as shorthand for the island’s history. There are natural attractions, splendid scenery, endemic plants and friendly people who always greet you in the street, but it is the historical legacy that appeals. The uninhabited island was annexed by the English East India Company in 1659 and remained in their hands (except for a few months of 1673 when the Dutch invaded) until 1834 when the British crown assumed control. The island was used as a base from which company ships could be supplied with fresh food and water on their return journey from India. To that end, there had to be a coastal settlement and Jamestown was developed in a valley dominated by 30 degree slopes, a scenic but most dangerous site (Figure 8.4). The island had to be fortified to prevent its capture and is a treasure trove of late seventeenth to early nineteenth century fortifications and structures (Royle 2007). When Napoleon was imprisoned there after Waterloo until his death in 1821, an additional legacy was added. There are no good beaches
Figure 8.2  Moai at Ahu Tongariki, Easter Island

Source: Author.

Figure 8.3  Handicraft Market, Easter Island

Source: Author.
and the island’s niche market is the history buff, people who want to see the unusual, not the commonplace. Such people are again, often, well on in years and wealthy. These are the people who go as tourists now; the airport will bring more.

Figure 8.4 Jamestown, St. Helena

Finally, the Falklands, where tourism rivals agriculture as the second industry, behind fishing. There are two niches here. There is little to attract the history buff, the best building is a small, brick cathedral from the 1890s with a whalebone arch outside it, which, perhaps by itself, is not worth the journey. More recent history is a different matter and that reflects an older past. The islands were settled by the French in 1774, who sold their settlement to Spain through whom what became Argentina traces its claim. The British, though they had sighted the islands first and landed on them earlier, did not settle until 1775, not knowing about the French in another part of the extensive archipelago, and there was almost warfare when they discovered each other. Settlement was marginal and the islands were left free of governance, but not entirely without people, until the British re-established a military presence in 1833, following which the Falklands developed economies based on ship supply and, later, sheep farming for wool. In 1982, for reasons connected largely with domestic matters, Argentina, whose claim never lapsed, invaded, expelled the token British garrison. The British responded under
the determined Margaret Thatcher, still revered on the islands, and the Argentineans were expelled following a brief, bloody campaign, which left sites and memorials in many places. The 1982 Conflict is an important tourism niche for military historians and those who had served there. The Falklands tourism authorities and the private sector providers are willing to capitalise on the Conflict, but strive also, to broaden the appeal (Figure 8.5). The key is the wildlife, principally avian, but also marine mammals such as elephant seals and sea lions. The islands are very sparsely populated: 1,989 of the 2,491 civilians (2001 census) live in Stanley. This means that, whilst the environment is not pristine—there have been changes wrought by

Figure 8.5 Downed Argentine Aircraft from 1982 Conflict, West Falkland

Source: Author.
sheep ranching—it is less altered than many places and the wildlife remains both spectacular and relatively accessible by four-wheel drive vehicles. The wildlife includes several varieties of the enchanting penguins, making them the icon of the Falkland Islands (Figure 8.6). Cruise ship passengers go to see penguins. So do the land-based tourists, although to some of them, the black-browed albatross is equally iconic. The land-based tourists attracted are, again, those with specialist interests in either the Conflict or the wildlife. Though such tourists are not necessarily wealthy, the high cost of reaching the islands would require an accumulation of capital, and this certainly isolates the Falklands from the mass market.

Figure 8.6  Gentoo Penguins, East Falkland

CONCLUSION

In sum, islands everywhere market themselves as special and there is indeed something special about an island: Baum’s (1997) ‘fact of difference’ identifies a romance associated with boundeness and separation as is also explored in books on island tourism (Apostulpoulos 2001; Briguglio et al. 1996; Lonnides et al. 2001; Lockhart and Drakakis-Smith 1996). Many ‘mainland islands’ in core tourist areas, in reality, operate in ways little different to neighbouring resorts
on the continent. By contrast, there are ‘entry islands’ nearer to or still beyond the edge of the pleasure periphery, which face essentially insular problems of maximising access and market share in often difficult circumstances, by making something of what nature or humankind has bequeathed, to establish a niche on which to base their tourism. Perhaps the success of one such island might be measured by St. Helena’s attempt to attract tourists to take ship by marketing itself as ‘the world’s best kept travel secret’ (*The Times* 2005).
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter seeks to explore the relationship between national parks, tourism, marketing and promotion, both conceptually and practically. It examines the structure and nature of the relationship between these areas. The implications of tourism, and particularly ecotourism’s worldwide growth, have been significant for national parks, particularly in Australia, where national parks are a crucial asset for building a sustainable tourism industry. Australia has an image among international markets as a clean, green destination and some of our most important tourism icons (such as Uluru and the Great Barrier Reef) are within national parks. In fact, almost half of all international tourists to Australia currently visit a national park during their trip (more if the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park is included). If the tourism industry is to meet its future potential, then it is essential that these important attractions are funded adequately, provide quality visitor experiences and are promoted appropriately.

Marketing has brought to national park management an ‘alternative’ paradigm, which has made possible an increase in the breadth and depth of understanding as to how national parks need to shift their management approaches in the era of neo liberalist economies. Specific approaches such as marketing can increase the ‘view’ and identify new issues for park management. Issues such as how national parks fit into the broader spectrum of society and how they engage with tourism which has centralised national parks as a part of its product, are now being considered. Fundamental to understanding and evaluating the connection between national parks and tourism, is the issue of supply versus demand-driven marketing and promotion. This will be examined in depth, using examples to provide support for the marketing and promotion of national parks as tourism destinations.
THE MULTIPLE ROLES OF NATIONAL PARKS AND PARK MANAGEMENT AGENCIES

Before focussing on marketing, it is necessary to first consider the broader responsibilities and roles of park management agencies, thereby providing a contextual backdrop to the substantive content of this discussion.

Most public sector organisations differ from private enterprise in that unlike the private sector, they tend to have multiple purposes. Public sector organisations engage not only in the direct delivery of services to the public but many also have additional, different purposes (Donnelly 1999) which include building community pride, a community governing itself, promoting choice, and building diversity and channels for learning. Park management agencies are, of course, public organisations and thus, the complexities facing them are considerable given the diverse range of stakeholders to be considered, including not only park users, but future users, non-users, commercial sector partners, local communities, citizens, management, employees and other public sector agencies. This situation can be further complicated by the fact that national parks and wilderness reserves are not managed by a single federal agency but are the responsibility of individual state and territory governments.

An increasingly primary focus among Australian park management agencies has been on delivering quality services to the public (Archer and Wearing 2002). This service delivery role typically includes but is not restricted to the protection of natural and cultural values, provision of quality recreation and tourism opportunities, interpretation and educational services, weed and feral animal eradication, and fire management.

Park management agencies also have an important role to play in building broader community awareness and facilitating a sense of community value, ownership and affinity with national parks. The protection and conservation of Australia’s natural and cultural heritage in the long-term depends on not just addressing the needs of park users, but also on building a level of community understanding and acceptance of the history, place and value of national parks as representative examples of natural and cultural diversity. Meeting these responsibilities is increasingly difficult as significant management and external challenges are faced by national parks agencies in Australia. For example, some authors (for example, Coaldrake and Stedman 1998; Foster 2000) have commented on the increasing pressure faced by public sector agencies from reductions in public funding, calls for improvement in the quality of services delivered and pressure to outsource the delivery of some services.

At the same time, park managers have come under increasing pressure to accommodate more visitors to their estates. The general reduction in public funding has put pressure on park management agencies to seek alternative sources of revenue and has led to a situation where visitor numbers are now a central component of agency performance measurement.
Additional pressure has also come from the private sector, with the tourism industry calling for the provision of more opportunities to meet the increasing demands of international and domestic tourists (Foster 2000). National parks and the natural environment are now strategically positioned in planning documents and marketed aggressively by the tourism industry and marketing organisations in all Australian states and territories. This, in turn, is putting pressure on park management agencies to provide visitors with quality services.

Visitor satisfaction is also used by park management agencies as a key indicator of management performance in delivering quality services and programmes. Ensuring that park users are satisfied encompasses more than just providing settings and facilities. People bring with them various expectations, experiences, needs and motivations for visiting a national park. Likewise, their own values and attitudes to national parks also play a key role in their level of satisfaction. In summary, it is possible to identify three macro roles that park management agencies have to fulfil:

- The preservation and conservation of natural and cultural heritage, a role that always should take primacy.
- Delivery of a wide range of services to multiple community and stakeholder groups.
- Building broad community awareness, and valuing ownership and affinity with natural and cultural heritage.

**MARKETING AND PARK MANAGEMENT**

Consequently, pivotal to understanding the marketing relationship for national parks and tourism are the implications for protected areas, conservation and local communities. The marketing of national parks and tourism has been surrounded by much confusion and controversy, as on one hand, it attempts to take into account the dual objectives of protected areas and local communities and on the other hand, those of the tourism industry. Whereas interpretation and education programmes have long been established within protected area management, Archer and Wearing (2002) observe that marketing as a management concept has a relatively short history in Australian agencies. According to them, there has been a perception among some people within park management that the larger interests of the community and environment are at risk of being overwhelmed by market place and commercial interests associated with the commercial sector, including the tourism industries.

The marketing of tourism products is generally still associated by many people with a commercial enterprise selling the maximum level of product for short-term profit. However, in recent years, social marketing and ecological marketing have been acknowledged as important elements of a more holistic marketing perspective. These perspectives significantly challenge the somewhat archaic belief that all marketing must be demand led (Middleton 1998).
TOURISM IN NATIONAL PARKS

Any definition or range of relationships such as the ones we seek to establish here must have relevance to its practical implementation and its working context—the tourism industry. What then is this thing called the ‘tourism industry’ and what are its characteristics? Stear et al. (1998: 1) provide us with an initial definition: ‘[a] collection of all collaborating firms and organizations which perform specific activities directed at satisfying leisure, pleasure and recreational needs.’

An industry can be considered a group of sellers of close substitute outputs who supply to a common group of buyers. The tourism industry does not produce close substitute products, as does the manufacturing industry, but it comprises sectors, each of which produces closely substitutable products. Tourism industry sectors include accommodation, attractions, carrier, coordination, promotion and distribution, tour operators and wholesalers and miscellaneous groups (Stear et al. 1988). Conceptualising the relationship between national parks and protected areas and tourism as an amalgam of products incorporating a particular ‘style’ of tourism allows its relationship with the tourism industry to be understood (Jenkins and McArthur 1996). In this way the relationship can be seen not within the confines of one industry per se, but to draw from ideas in a range of sectors that may assist in developing this relationship.

MARKETING DEFINED

In order to gain an understanding of the marketing and promotion of national parks for tourism, it is important to examine exactly what marketing is. Traditionally, marketing has been defined as ‘the development of products/services which are consistent with client needs, pricing, promoting, and distributing these products/services effectively’ (National Park Service 1984: 3). However, marketing is neither a precise science nor is it an art, but is chiefly ‘concerned with research, which is the foundation for organised planning’ (Jefferson and Lickorish 1988: 27). It is primarily ‘concerned with production and pricing and promotion and not least profits’ (ibid.). Marketing is a component in a system of business activities: ‘Designed to plan, price, promote and distribute want—satisfying products, services and ideas for the benefit of the target market—present and potential household consumers or industrial users, to achieve the organisation’s objectives’ (Stanton et al. 1992: 6).

The term ‘organisation’s objectives’ is critical here as it leads to the heart of the ideas this chapter is exploring. What should be the primary objective of a tourism operator in operating in a national park or protected area? Sustaining the environment or profitability? Can the two objectives be pursued successfully and simultaneously? Can profitability be maintained without the long-term protection of the environment?
The tourism industry has been swift to capitalise on new forms of tourism and in some cases, the principles and philosophy of national parks and protected areas have been lost in the rush to profit. However, in the last 10 years the tourism industry has moved in the direction of more cooperative approaches to ensure sustainability. Naturally, both private enterprise and governments are supportive of the tourism industry because of its present and potential economic benefits in the form of individual profit for firms, which accrue to nation states in the form of Gross National Product (GNP). Conversely, the tourism industry is equally supportive of park management agencies to ensure a sustainable basis for its operation.

**Setting up the Criteria for Marketing National Parks**

As indicated in the definition, marketing is based on the ‘four Ps’ of product, place, price and promotion, with the emphasis on attracting, maintaining and expanding a customer base. Theoretically, markets are places where buyers and sellers meet to engage in exchange. In the process of exchange, prices are determined and quantities produced, and this process hinges on the amount of demand for a particular product. Economists generally view demand as the desire and ability to consume certain quantities of goods at various prices over a certain period of time. The law of demand states that the quantity of a good or service is negatively related to its price. In other words, if everything is held constant, consumers will purchase more of a good or service at a lower price than at a higher price. Tourism is no different in this respect. Tourism marketing is demand-led, that is to say, if there is a demand for a certain product or service by consumers, it will be supplied and marketed by profit-maximising organisations. This demand orientation determines that the ‘requirements of the tourists are given highest priority and the destination area seeks to provide services to meet those requirements’ (Ashworth and Goodall 1990: 227).

Supply, on the other hand, refers to what firms are actually willing and able to produce and offer for sale at various prices over a period of time. The law of supply is concerned with the fact that the quantity of a good or service supplied is usually a positive function of price. With all else held constant, suppliers usually will supply less of a good or service at a lower price. As we can see, if there are limited number of national park ‘destinations’, prices can play an important role in controlling demand. Supply-driven tourism places considerations other than profit at the centre of tourism products. Considerations such as the social impact of the tourism product on destination sites, the needs and wants of destination communities and the natural resource management of the supplier country and destination sites become central.

This type of marketing is relevant to the marketing of national parks and is used in areas such as ecotourism, which means that the ‘impact on the local natural resource base is more easily controlled than is the case with demand side tourism…dangers of overload and cultural submersion and tourists exceeding biological carrying capacities may be thus minimized’ (Lillywhite and Lillywhite 1990: 92). Therefore, the marketing approaches of ecotourism are
imperative for national parks and protected areas. To establish the best methods for marketing national parks it is essential to consider them as an ecotourism destination and it is important to stress the necessity that marketing to be a holistic enterprise, working with community groups and indigenous and other private voluntary organisation programmes.

ECOLOGICAL MARKETING IN NATIONAL PARKS

Ecological marketing differs from traditional marketing and relates very strongly to the marketing of national parks and protected areas as it involves the marketing of products and services with positive ecological outcomes to environmentally concerned consumers (Wearing et al. 2005). However, it would be naive to suggest that organisations practising ecological marketing are not motivated in any way for making a profit, but this is not their sole measure of success. Quantifiable and unquantifiable outcomes are equally pursued, such as long-term environmental protection and customer satisfaction. Profit determines the level of product viability but is not the only measure of success. This is particularly relevant to the marketing of national parks and protected areas where the prime concern is the conservation of the natural environments they are legislated to protect.

It has been suggested that for national parks where ecological marketing is a key element (Wearing and Neil 1999), ‘the relationship between demand and supply’ is the prime issue (Henion and Kinnear 1976: 1). Ecological marketing questions the role of demand stimulation: if the product is environmentally harmful, demand stimulation is strongly discouraged (Henion and Kinnear 1976). This is of fundamental importance to national parks and protected areas in Australia as a result of growing interest in these areas as the destination and at a much faster rate than mass tourism. More and more members of the travelling public are opting out of the traditional ‘lie around the pool’ holiday and are instead choosing a more experiential ecotourism product and ‘these people are going to create a demand and this demand is going to be met as usual by supply’ (Richardson 1991: 245). The danger is that supply may be met not by the small, environmentally concerned operators, but by mass tourism operators with little understanding or concern about the environment.

As is obvious, marketing by tourism operators based on generating maximum demand for short-term profitability is defeatist. By exceeding the deemed carrying capacity of the venue, failing to reconcile facility management strategies with those of the adjacent natural environment or attracting a clientele with little regard for the preservation and conservation of the environment, the management risks degrading the resources on which visitation is founded. For many tourism operators, particularly those with a fixed asset (such as accommodation establishments), there is an incentive to plan, develop and operate their business with ethical consideration for not only their venture but also for the surrounding areas which are subject to impacts from tourists. High capital investment in facilities and its associated risk is an incentive to provide a quality experience for prospective visitors, translated into long-term cash flow and profitability based on heightened satisfaction (Middleton 1998).
Given the growth and changing nature of tourism, it would appear that in order to market destinations such as national parks successfully, operators will have to refocus their approaches to planning and communication strategies. That is, success cannot be measured by the number of people who visit the operation, but consideration must be given as to the customers’ levels of satisfaction and their likelihood of returning. The total experience including the emotional wants of the guests must be considered and not just their functional requirements. Methods to do this often take the form of feedback from clients through surveys and questionnaires or just by talking to them, which can give some indication as to the emotional benefits they gained from the experience.

Sustainability is a critical element of managing all aspects of the marketing and promotion of national parks. It is derived not only from repeat patronage, but preservation of the physical and social environments of the region utilised, on which education and interpretation of the environment are dependent. Just as feedback from tourists themselves is essential in determining the success of the business (in terms other than monetary), impacts of the business venture itself must be ascertained. This is frequently carried out as an environmental impact assessment in the initial phases of development, which provides a ‘snapshot’ of likely environmental effects, and thus, the planning of management regimes created to combat them.

National parks and other protected areas form the basis for much of the visitation and appreciation of the natural attributes of a region. Although this dictates a degree of stewardship in order to preserve the resource, it provides a low cost attraction on which tourism products may be developed and moulded. As a marketeer of a potential product/service, the natural attributes of the area are important to consider, including the geography, geology, and the flora and fauna. The unique and varied nature of many protected natural areas provides an excellent basis for the development of specialised services focussing on a limited geographic zone, which can be translated to an appropriate advertising campaign and areas for sustainable competitive advantage.

For example, many tourists are very discerning and take time to educate themselves about a destination prior to departure. Therefore, an active knowledge base is a major factor in the tourist’s decision-making process. There are strong correlations between involvement and information sourcing, and receptivity to promotional stimuli. This means that careful market research into the form of advertising most likely to attract the consumer by heightened involvement is liable to have a profound effect in achieving response, and therefore, producing a decision based on the characteristics of the target market.

**Codes of Conduct**

The incorporation of environmental principles and responsible behaviour codes in developing national parks as sustainable destinations is an essential element of the marketing and promotion of these areas. It is indicative of an increasing consumer challenge to traditional
ethics, in a search for new alternatives to traditional tourism activity (Wright 1993). As has been evident in Australia, codes of practice have emerged to integrate the concepts of sustainability and stewardship for appropriate behaviour relative to national park visitation. These are most often in the form of ‘Codes of Ethics’ which concentrate on the activities of the consumer/tourist, rather than the operators themselves (ibid.). This has, however, started to change with the movement to accreditation of operators (NEAP 2002).

**Threats in Marketing and Promoting National Parks**

In the last few years, ‘national parks’ have become a marketing buzzword and have been used to sell any number of products, commonly using the ‘eco’ tag with no real indication of the quality of the product on offer. National parks have become synonymous with ‘ecotourism’. There has been a substantial increase in the quantity of products in this vein. A multitude of references abound to the experiences to be found in national parks such as ‘ecotour’, ‘ecosafari’ and ‘ecotravel’. One reason for the increasing proliferation of the national park label is the general lack of understanding as to what national parks represent. Some of the products being marketed are totally unrelated to operational and legal boundaries of the national parks, yet it is this label which is being used to sell them.

As a result, a number of problems or negative trends make continued marketing and promotion of national parks unsustainable. This relates to the fact that ‘principles fundamental to ecotourism are not being incorporated into the conception, planning, design, development, operation or marketing of the product’ (Wright 1993: 4), which this discussion suggests is an essential part of building a symbiosis between national parks and the tourism industry. Inappropriate developments are taking place in sensitive locations and many private operators and sometimes even government agencies are latching onto the short-term economic benefits of ecotourism, ‘without giving due regard to the underlying principles of ecotourism’, (ibid.: 55) or protected area management.

Demand factors have been primarily focussed on by tourism suppliers—either the government or industry—and they seem to be particularly interested in developing supply in response to the demand driven market (Wright 1993). As with other tourism segments, ‘demand information is viewed as enabling greater numbers of visitors to be attracted,’ as well as enabling more effective marketing (ibid.: 56). However, this orientation is not necessarily compatible with protected area management and is largely due to general confusion about what national parks represent and also in part to the varying mix of so many different activities and experiences to be found in these areas. Here we can look to ecotourism as a way to analyse this for national parks and protected areas and move forward; so as Wright suggests, rather than defining ecotourism in terms of products, it is more valuable to recognise that within ecotourism there are a number of experiences which may be supplied and demanded. These may vary according to the following supply and demand factors (Wright 1993):
The supply factors are:

- the nature and resilience of the resource;
- the cultural or local community preferences; and
- the types of accommodation, facilities and programmes.

The demand factors are:

- the types of activities and experiences encountered;
- degree of interest in natural or cultural resources; and
- the degree of physical effort.

While these issues are specific to ecotourism, many overlap into what is now being undertaken in the form of marketing national parks and protected areas. In both cases, negative consumer opinion may result from a product offering that does not satisfy their needs and expectations and simultaneously assumes the ‘cover’ of environmental responsibility. Degradation of natural resources as a consequence of over-demand and visitation may result in a lack of visitor satisfaction and subsequently, a loss of demand. Additionally, an unethical operator may exceed carrying capacities to bolster revenue through attracting increasing number of consumers at a reduced price. Accreditation within the ecotourism industry has gone some way towards reducing instances of this scenario (NEAP 2002), but government intervention is still necessary to control overuse of national parks.

**Opportunities for Marketing National Parks**

The proliferation of interest groups, particularly nature-based organisations, provides an opportunity for direct marketing of national parks to this market. Targeting specific age groups and nature-based groups such as adventure seekers, educational institutions, bushwalkers, canyoneers and scientific groups is an extremely effective method of attracting users with a conservation orientation. Advertising in publications accessed by these groups, directly mailing promotional material to such organisations and cause-related marketing are methods of utilising the communication channels of maximum benefit to the ecotourism operator. Remember, ‘ecotourism should not be geared towards the masses, but smaller groups of discerning visitors who will pay more for an authentic value-for-money experience’ (Kerr 1991: 250).

**Icon Parks**

Developing an image of the destination or an image of the experience is crucial in maximising involvement and influencing the decision-making behaviour of the intended audience.
The way in which people interact with a particular physical setting is predisposed by the existence of images by which the environment is organised (Ittleson et al. 1974). A study in 1994 examined the relationship between a traveller’s motivation to visit a destination and the strength of the image assigned to that place, finding that high motivation with poor image ratings contributed to the most unsatisfactory experience. However, high motivation and high image respondents were most likely to repeat their visit. Therefore, the creation of a strong image that is a realistic reflection of the product is extremely beneficial (Menning and McCool 1993). This is particularly significant when dealing with the marketing of natural areas such as national parks.

In order to ensure the sustainability of any tourism venture in national parks and the area on which ecotourism or adventure tourism is based, the managerial philosophy adopted should be holistic. Tourism operators aligning their managerial plans with those existing and carried out by reserve/protected area/wilderness area management is an example. The recognition of the similarities that exist between the impacts that tourism generates and those produced through recreational use of specific environments facilitates a transfer of managerial strategies which mitigate the effects that visitors may have on any facility or surrounding region (Mercer 1995). This can only result in an improvement in the product itself, possible cost advantages and the opportunity to promote the nature of this strategy to entice ‘hard core’ ecotourists.

**ECOTOURISM AS A MODEL FOR MARKETING NATIONAL PARKS**

Both national parks management agencies and the tourism industry are relatively new to the marketing of national parks. One specific area that has successfully marketed natural areas in the past is ‘ecotourism’, where it has taken on the idea of promoting nature-based activity and experiences based around national parks and protected areas. Ecotourism product marketing has been significantly improved through increasing analysis and study of carrying capacities and host communities prior to operation establishment; improved educational and interpretive material; and a greater focus on providing a quality experience by value-added attributes to the product. Limitations on supply can only be beneficial in assisting this aim, by emphasising quality over quantity: ‘All organizations in nature tourism should emphasise quality product, rather than quantity, to keep the numbers of visitors at a manageable level to protect the environment’ (Kerr 1991: 252).

In a supply-led industry, carrying capacities must first be determined and then marketing strategies decided on, so that these levels are reached but not exceeded. This level must be developed in conjunction with local communities, as the socially responsible and environmentally viable goals of ecotourism ‘cannot be fostered without a dialogue constructed and controlled along indigenous needs and in indigenous terms’ (Craik 1991: 80). There are three
primary ways for tourism reliant on national parks and protected areas to grow and remain profitable (Merschen 1992: 60):

- increasing the size of groups on an ecotour;
- establishing more ecotourism destinations; and
- charging higher prices.

The first two options have a negative impact on the environment as well as being demand-rather than supply-driven. However, price manipulation is an effective means of decreasing demand to a level that does not exceed the carrying capacity of a region. Increasing prices is not necessarily negative as ‘consumers may impute high quality to a high-priced product and low quality to a low priced product’ (Henion 1975: 233), and the fact that national parks and protected areas are a prestigious product can be emphasised in marketing activities. If prices are to be increased, tour operators should donate some of this additional revenue to environmental causes, such as the improvement of infrastructure. Drawing the consumer’s attention to this strategy would also benefit the operator, as tourists travelling with ecotour operators appear to be ‘especially satisfied that a certain percentage of their tour cost is being donated to conservation’ (Boo 1990: 41). This already occurs in Costa Rica, where money donated by tour operators is put back into rainforest preservation programmes (Masson 1991).

National parks and protected area marketing can also be improved significantly in the area of promotion. Promotion is the communication, persuasion strategy and tactics that will make the product more familiar, acceptable and even desirable to the audience (Kotler and Armstrong 1993). Central promotional issues that need to be addressed by the tourism operators are:

- the selection of target markets or ‘niches’;
- joint marketing; and
- effective selection of promotional methods such as direct mail and special interest magazines.

Many marketing theorists have emphasised the importance of a highly targeted marketing campaign as opposed to a strategy that attempts to appeal to a broad sweep of consumers. This involves obtaining data such as demographic and psychographic profiles of the potential market segments and aligning operations with the identified consumer group that corresponds best with the ideals of the specific venture. For example, ecotourists are known to utilise a wide range of media to gain accurate in-depth information on a destination or area of interest to them. Information distributed in special interest magazines and direct mail rather than newspapers and radio advertising may be one method of reaching the target market. Direct mail offers a particularly effective strategy to promote ecotourism (Durst and Ingram 1989). Direct mail involves a selected person receiving promotional material about a product. Where
ecotourism is concerned, direct mail is particularly effective for keeping in touch with previous customers and encouraging them to take another tour with the ecotourism operator. Overall, it ‘is probably the most effective medium out there’ (Merschen 1992).

Joint marketing strategies by groups of two or more tourism operators also offer an effective means to market an ecotourism product due to the efficient use of resources that may already be strained by the small size of ecotourism ventures. Joint marketing is more cost efficient and enables greater numbers of a target audience to be reached. Vertical joint marketing is particularly effective, for example, where a tour operator, an accommodation establishment and a carrier join promotional efforts and link their services. Additionally, if tour operators work together in marketing, chances are they will work together in other areas such as carrying capacity determination, which would produce beneficial effects for the environment and local populations impacted upon by ecotourism.

The final broad area where using national park and protected area for tourism marketing can be improved is in distribution, or the ‘place’ where the customer is able to purchase a tour from. ‘The poor results of many social campaigns can be attributed in part to their failure to suggest clear action outlets for those motivated to acquire the product’ (Kotler and Andreasen 1991: 101). This is a regular occurrence with ecotourism; consumers motivated enough to inquire about ecotours at retail travel agents are often persuaded by these agents to choose a conventional tourism product (Richardson 1991). However, in a supply-led industry, this restriction in demand may not be entirely negative. Wearing and Neil (1999) suggest that ecotourism operators should not distribute their tours through general travel agents. The tours should only be sold through travel agents who specialise in ecotourism (Boo 1990), or directly by the operators themselves. This will thereby restrict supply and also increase the efficiency of the ecotourism operators’ marketing efforts, as they will no longer have to waste time in mostly futile bids to convince travel agents to market their tours. This will also enable the operators to exercise more control over the type of tourists that participate in a tour with the company, ensuring — where possible — that tourists motivated by environmental concerns make up the majority of the group.

**Development of a Marketing Strategy**

From the above analysis of marketing by the tourism industry of national parks and protected areas, it is apparent that numerous aspects of its development need to be ensured to produce sound marketing and sustainable resource management in order to shape demand and expectations appropriately. These can be summarised as follows:

- The marketing and promotion of national parks and protected areas requires sensitively developed tourist infrastructure in or adjacent to these areas. The tourism industry, therefore, must accept integrated planning and regulation. To date, tourism development
has occurred incidentally to the urban, rural and foreshore development, as in many countries there is no specific tourism zoning. Economic development demands increasingly stringent environmental assessment techniques and reports to be included in applications for development, especially in countries where economic imperatives may take precedent over more qualitative aspects such as environmental, social and cultural significance of development.

- The marketing and promotion of national parks and protected areas requires a supply led tourism industry. For this to become a reality, the industry must first define itself holistically, and second, agree to cooperate with and support a coordinating body or authority to make decisions about the number of operators, operating licences, ceiling numbers for tours, price structures, and so forth. Structural considerations such as pricing, economies of scale, price yield management and all other financial tools will have to be modified accordingly. The very philosophy of successful segments such as ecotourism calls on low volume tourism with high ticket prices per head. This tactic also negates the business philosophy of competitive pricing to win new customers, either from the latent market or from competitors.

- The body responsible for making these decisions and policing industry activities needs to be a third party to the tourism industry. However, care must be taken in appointing a government department or commission to adopt such a role, as even the government is not impartial to its interests in tourism growth because of the short-term revenue that tourism can create for a region, state or country, especially where foreign currency is concerned.

- The marketing and promotion of national parks and protected areas requires the establishment of carrying capacities and strict monitoring of these. It is a task that no profit motivated organisation in the industry sees as its responsibility. The establishment of carrying capacities requires a comprehensive knowledge and expertise in the field of environmental, social and cultural assessments. The latter two are very difficult to measure but a commendable starting point is with the host community, by identifying in partnership with each community, what is of social and cultural importance. This task in itself requires a great deal of time to be invested in living with and learning from the community in order to establish these social and cultural carrying capacities. Monitoring is an essential component of carrying capacity management. It requires ongoing financial and human resource commitment to monitor and evaluate impacts and changing relationships.

- The marketing and promotion of national parks and protected areas relies on the environmentally sensitive behaviour and operations of tour operators and tourists, but the proponents of ecotourism may have placed undue faith in the notion that the behaviour of tourists, developers and other industry operators can be modified through education and awareness programmes (Butler 1990; Pigram 1989). In recent years, there has been a flood of ‘codes of ethics’, of ‘charters’ released by a variety of tourism industry
groups and environmental organisations ranging from conservation groups (World Wide Fund for Nature, Australian Conservation Foundation) to industry groups (Australia Tourism Industry Association [ATIA] 1990; Pacific Asia Travel Association [PATA] 1992). The benefits of raising awareness in this fashion have been tentatively acknowledged (Jarviluoma 1992), but it remains to be seen whether this results in modified behaviour.

**MARKETING VERSUS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

The primary marketing factors that may be assessed and altered to fit with the environmental objectives in marketing for national parks and protected areas are:

- Target marketing—the group of people at which an agency specifically aims its marketing effort;
- Positioning statements—how you want your target markets to view your agency and its ‘product’;
- Company objectives; and
- Marketing mix—product, place (distribution), promotion and price.

Target marketing is an important procedure in marketing of ecotourism and can be used in the marketing and promotion of national parks and protected areas. Because ecotourism is specific in its philosophies, it is important to select target markets that are compatible with its organisational goals and objectives. A small group of potential customers may be targeted, which shares one or more similar characteristics and has certain similar ideas as to what do they want from the ecotourism experience. Some of these preferences would be the desire to travel to relatively remote areas, for the purpose of studying a natural area and its culture, having minimum impact on the environment and with the expectation of gaining educational gratification, along with the knowledge that they will return something to the local community.

While considering the target market, a number of things need to be considered. First, socio-demographic characteristics that include things such as age/family life cycle stage, sex, income, education and occupation. Second, it is necessary to consider behavioural characteristics. This is a very important stage in selecting target markets for ecotourism, as it enables marketeers to decide what characteristics will they select people on. It includes consideration of:

- the benefits sought;
- the consumers motivations, perceptions of the ecotourism ‘product’;
- the level of skill—is it necessary for targets to have some basic level of skills before embarking on an ecotourism experience?
• psychographic profiles—a concept that explains consumers attitudes, opinions and lifestyles; and
• behavioural characteristics, which are especially important in choosing target markets because they can later be used as criteria in selecting people for specific ‘ecotours’—as a marketeer for an ecotourism destination, it is important to be specific in selection, as you want a certain type of people to participate who are compatible with agency goals and objectives.

Positioning is an important consideration when marketing an ecotourism destination. Positioning is what the marketeer ‘wants the target market to think about the product, therefore positioning of the product must be consumer oriented’ (Tonge and Myott 1989: 168). Ecotourism marketeers seek to differentiate their ‘product’ from mass tourism. An agency’s positioning objectives (for the area and product) would encompass everything that ecotourism stands for: sustainable development, minimal impact, local control, supply-driven, quality experiences, and so on.

The marketing mix constitutes the core of an agency’s marketing system. The identification of client groups and the marketing mix represents the combination of variables that the agency can control and manipulate to achieve desired outcomes. Once these decisions have been taken, the ‘service’ is offered in the dynamic environment of the community: ‘The dynamic nature of this external environment is comprised of a host of variables such as political and legal forces, economic considerations, technology and competition’ (Crompton and Howard 1980: 332). The agency cannot control these variables. Therefore, it must adapt to them.

At this point, in determining the marketing mix, it could be suggested that the agency adopt a different strategy. Normally, the marketing mix activities are used to encourage potential customers to take advantage of the services offered or to increase their usage. Ecotourism, however, is one of those areas that is faced by the need to discourage demand for a service. For example, exceeding carrying capacities in a remote wilderness area may provide short-term satisfaction for some, at the expense of overriding the ecotourism philosophy, and maximising public welfare and client group satisfaction over the long term. Because ecotourism is dealing with a ‘scarce resource’, the agency may effectively use the marketing mix for discouraging participation. This discouraging of demand has been termed ‘demarketing’:

To emphasise that marketing may be used to decrease as well as increase the number of satisfied customers. Demarketing is not a negative concept … a decrease in numbers can lead to an increase in clientele satisfaction, through preserving a higher quality experience. (Crompton and Howard 1980: 333)

Methods of demarketing may include:

• increasing prices: so they increase disproportionately as time spent in the ecotourism destination increases;
creating a queuing situation to increase the time and opportunity costs of the experience;
• limiting the main promotional strategy to select specialised media;
• promoting the importance of the area through education of the public and the need to conserve the area through minimal impact and sustainable development;
• promoting a range of alternative opportunities in surrounding areas which may satisfy needs and wants;
• stressing the environmental degradation that could occur, if too many people frequent the area; and
• stressing any restrictions or difficulties associated with travel to the area.

Product and distribution need to be looked at a little differently. In the case of ecotourism and the marketing of national parks, the product is essentially intangible which provides a set of want-satisfying benefits to a customer in an exchange. The product is the place, region or area and because an area is a non-renewable resource it is imperative that it be maintained in its original natural state. Ecotourism in its purest form aims to do this. National parks similarly have a key conservation role. Distribution is the ‘channel structure’ used to transfer products and services from an agency to its markets. Destination areas are usually remote, and therefore, less accessible. This part of the marketing mix, as with the ‘product’, is virtually impossible to alter.

CONCLUSION

Marketing has brought a significant paradigm change to the thinking of protected area agencies in Australia. It has often been seen in the past as simply a means to sell a product to a mass market, and therefore, had negative connotations. From this discussion it is clear that through appropriate and stringent strategies, an agency can market a ‘destination’ in a way that complies with organisational goals and objectives and upholds the ecotourism philosophy. Through manipulation of the essential marketing mix factors, target markets, positioning statements and company objectives, marketing can be utilised as a tool for directing the future development of ecotourism within the boundaries of sustainable development. Effective promotion and communication strategies are one of the industry’s best opportunities to shape consumer demand and expectations, so that they are reconciled with the product offered.

Ideally, ecotourism provides a symbiotic relationship with marketing of protected areas as it is a small-scale, low-key tourism, so as to minimise the impacts that may occur on destination environments. Methods of achieving this may mean imposing ceiling numbers, which, in turn, suggests economically that prices charged per person will be somewhat higher than ‘mainstream tourism’, where economies of scale and competition help determine pricing structures within and between organisations operating within one destination. These objectives, however, are unlikely to be reached in light of the nature and characteristics of the tourism industry in its present operations. The initial objectives of ecotourism in a new
destination may be to remain low-key and small-scale, but it is difficult to guarantee this once
the tourism industry perceives a new product development opportunity and starts to market
that opportunity (Boele 1993).

Suggested restrictions associated with sustainable development and ecotourism have
included both qualitative and quantitative measures, including charging higher prices for
access to tourist destinations and attractions. Indeed, restricting supply would automatically
increase the price of tourism products, thereby reducing the opportunities for some prospective
tourists. The question is whether this is consistent with the principle of equity, embodied in
the concept of sustainability, one of the central tenets of ecotourism.
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Globalising the Tourist Gaze

JOHN URRY

TOURISM AND THE GLOBAL

In 1990, when the author first published The Tourist Gaze, it was much less clear just how significant the processes we now call ‘globalisation’ were to become. Indeed the ‘internet’ had only just been invented and there was no indication how it would transform countless aspects of social life, being taken up more rapidly than any previous technology. And no sooner than the internet had begun to have an impact, that another ‘mobile technology’, the mobile phone, transformed communications practices ‘on the move’. Overall, the 1990s have seen remarkable ‘time–space compression’ as people across the globe have been brought ‘closer’ through various technologically assisted developments. There is increasingly, for many social groups, a ‘death of distance’ (Cairncross 1997), while Bauman (2000) describes the shift from a solid, fixed modernity to a much more fluid and speeded-up ‘liquid modernity’.

Part of this sense of compression of space has stemmed from the rapid flows of travellers and tourists, physically moving from place to place, and especially from hub airport to hub airport. Elsewhere, the author will distinguish between virtual travel through the internet, imaginative travel through phone, radio and TV, and corporeal travel along the infrastructures of the global travel industry (Urry 2000: Chapter 3). While, evidently the amount of ‘traffic’ along all these has magnified over the last two decades, there is no evidence that virtual and imaginative travel is replacing corporeal travel. But there are complex intersections between these different modes of travel that are increasingly de-differentiated from one another. Whether imaginative or corporeal travel, multitudes of options are available. For instance, to the Microsoft’s question of, ‘Where do you want to go today?’ there are many diverse and interdependent ways and means of getting ‘there’.

In particular, corporeal travel has taken on immense dimensions and comprises the largest ever movement of people across national borders. Because of these liquidities, the relations between almost all societies across the globe are mediated by flows of tourists, as place after place is reconfigured as a recipient of such flows. There is an omnivorous producing and ‘consuming [of] places’ from around the globe (Urry 1995). Core components that now help to perform contemporary global culture include the hotel buffet, the pool, the cocktail, the beach (Lencek and Bosker 1998), the airport lounge (Gottdiener 2001) and the bronzed tan (Ahmed 2000).
This omnivorousness presupposes the growth of ‘tourism reflexivity’, the set of disciplines, procedures and criteria that enable each (and every?) place to monitor, evaluate and develop its ‘tourism potential’ within the emerging patterns of global tourism. This reflexivity is concerned with identifying a particular place’s location within the contours of geography, history and culture that swirl the globe, and in particular, identifying that place’s actual and potential material and semiotic resources. One element in this ‘tourism reflexivity’ is the institutionalisation of tourism studies, of new monographs, textbooks, exotic conferences, departments and journals (including in the 1990s, *International Journal of Tourism Research, Tourism Studies, Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Journeys, Tourism Geographies*). There are also many consultancy firms interlinked with local, national and international states, companies, voluntary associations and NGOs. The emergence of this ‘tourism industry’ is well captured in the appalling figure of Rupert Sheldrake, an anthropologist of tourism, in David Lodge’s (1991) *Paradise News*.

This reflexivity is not simply a matter of individuals and their life possibilities, but of sets of systematic, regularised and evaluative procedures that enable each ‘place’ to monitor, modify and maximise their location within the turbulent global order. Such procedures ‘invent’, produce, market and circulate, especially through global TV and the internet, new or different or repackaged or niche-dependent places and their corresponding visual images. And the circulation of such images will invariably further the very idea of the ‘globe’ (Franklin et al. 2000).

Of course, not all members of the world community are equal participants within global tourism. Side-by-side with global tourists and travellers, within many of those ‘empty meeting places’ or ‘non-places’ of modernity such as the airport lounge, the coach station, the railway terminus, the motorway service stations, docks, and so on, are countless global exiles (Augé 1995; MacCannell 1992). Such exiles are fleeing from famine, war, torture, persecution and genocide, as economic and social inequalities and consequential displacements of population have magnified in recent years and have forced mobility upon many.

Significantly for the ‘tourist gaze’ an array of developments are taking ‘tourism’ from the margins of the global order, and indeed of the academy, to almost the centre of this emergent world of ‘liquid modernity’. First, tourism infrastructures have been constructed in what would have been thought of as the unlikeliest of places. While clearly most people across the world are not global tourists *qua* visitors, this does not mean that the places that they live in and the associated images of nature, nation, colonialism, sacrifice, community, heritage, and so on, are not powerful constituents of a rapacious global tourism. Some unexpected destinations that are now significantly implicated in the patterns of global tourism include Alaska, Auschwitz-Birkenau, Antarctica (especially in the Millennium year), Changi Jail in Singapore, Nazi occupation sites in the Channel Islands, Dachau, extinct coal mines, Cuba and especially its ‘colonial’ and ‘American’ heritages, Iceland, Mongolia, Mount Everest, Northern Ireland, Northern Cyprus under Turkish ‘occupation’, Pearl Harbour, post-communist Russia, Robben Island in South Africa, Sarajevo’s ‘massacre trail’, outer space, Titanic, Vietnam, and so on.
(see Lennon and Foley 2000 on ‘dark tourism’; O’Rourke 1988 on ‘holidays in hell’). In certain cases, becoming a tourist destination is part of a reflexive process by which societies and places place themselves on the global stage.

Further, there are large increases in the growth of tourists emanating from many very different countries, especially those from the ‘orient’, which once were places visited and consumed by those from the ‘West’. Now rising income levels of the Asian middle class (as well as the student study tour and ‘backpacker’ tourism) have generated a strong desire in them to see ‘for themselves’ those places of the ‘West’ that appear to have defined global culture. Hendry (2000), however, describes how various theme parks full of exotic features of ‘Westernness’ are now being established within various Asian countries. She describes this as ‘The Orient Strikes Back’, putting on display many features of Western culture for Asians to wonder at and exoticise, a kind of reverse orientalism.

Moreover, many types of work are now found within these circuits of global tourism. It is difficult not to be implicated within, or affected by, one or more of these circuits that increasingly overlap with a more general ‘economy of signs’ spreading across multiple spaces of consumption (Lash and Urry 1994). Such forms of work include transportation, hospitality (which includes sex tourism: Clift and Carter 1999), travel, design and consultancy — the producing of ‘images’ of global tourist sites, of global icons (the Eiffel Tower), iconic types (the global beach) and vernacular icons (Balinese dances) — the mediatising and circulating of images through print, TV, news, the Internet, and so on, and the organising through politics and protest campaigns for or against the construction or development of tourist infrastructures.

Also, enormously powerful and global brands or logos are ubiquitous (Klein 2000). Their fluid like power stems from how the most successful corporations over the last two decades have shifted from the actual manufacture of products to become brand producers, with enormous marketing, design, sponsorship, public relations and advertising expenditures. Such super brands include many companies involved in travel and leisure — Nike, Gap, Easyjet, Body Shop, Virgin, Club Med, Starbucks, and so on — that produce ‘concepts’ or ‘lifestyles’. They are ‘liberated from the real world burdens of stores and product manufacturing; these brands are free to soar, less as the dissemination of goods and services than as collective hallucinations’ (ibid.: 22).

There are thus, countless ways in which huge number of people and places get caught up in the swirling vortex of global tourism. They are not two separate entities — the ‘global’ and ‘tourism’ bearing some external connections with each other. Rather they are part and parcel of the same set of complex and interconnected processes. Moreover, such infrastructures, flows of images and people, and the emerging practices of ‘tourist reflexivity’ should be conceptualised as a ‘global hybrid’ that together enables it to expand and to reproduce itself across the globe (Urry 2000: Chapter 2). This is analogous to the mobilities of other global hybrids, such as the internet, automobility, global finance, and so on, that spread across the globe and reshapes and re-performs the ‘global’.
Embodying the Gaze

The author has, at times, referred to travel as corporeal travel. This is to emphasise something so obvious that it has often been forgotten that tourists moving from place to place comprise lumpy, fragile, aged, gendered and racialised bodies (Veijola and Jokinen 1994). Such bodies encounter other bodies, objects and the physical world multi-sensuously. Tourism always involves corporeal movement and forms of pleasure and these must be central in any sociology of diverse tourisms. In that sense, the tourist gaze always involves relations between bodies that are themselves in at least intermittent movement.

Bodies moreover perform themselves in between direct sensation of the ‘other’ and various sensescapes (Rodaway 1994). Bodies navigate backwards and forwards between directly sensing the external world, as they move bodily in and through it (or lie inertly waiting to be bronzed), and discursively mediated sensescapes that signify social taste and distinction, ideology and meaning. Such sensed and sensing bodies are concerned with various perfor-mativities. Bodies are not fixed and given, but involve performances, especially to fold notions of movement, nature, taste and desire, into and through the body. There are, thus, complex connections between bodily sensations and socio-cultural ‘sensescapes’, mediated by discourse and language (Crouch 2000; Macnaghten and Urry 2000, on embodied leisure-scapes). This can be seen in the case of much of tropical travel, such as to the Caribbean where early visitors were able to taste new fruits, to smell the flowers, to feel the heat of the sun, to immerse one’s body in the moist greenery of the rainforest, as well as to see new sights (Sheller 2002).

The body senses as it moves. It is endowed with kinaesthetics, the sixth sense that informs one of what the body is doing in space through the sensations of movement registered in its joints, muscles, tendons, and so on. Especially important in this sense of movement, the ‘mechanics of space’, is that of touch, of the feet on the pavement or the mountain path, the hands on a rock face or the steering wheel (Gil 1998: 126; Lewis 2001). Various objects and mundane technologies facilitate this kinaesthetic sense as they sensuously extend human capacities into and across the external world. There are thus various assemblages of humans, objects, technologies and scripts that contingently produce durability and stability of mobility. Such hybrid assemblages can roam countrysides and cities, remaking landscapes and townscapes through their movement.

One effect of mobile technologies is to change the nature of vision. The ‘static’ forms of the tourist gaze, such as that from ‘the balcony vantage point’, focusses on the two-dimensional shape, colours and details of the view that is laid out before one and can be moved around with one’s eyes (Pratt 1992: 222). Such a static gaze is paradigmatically captured through the still camera. By contrast, with what Schivelbusch (1986: 66) terms a ‘mobility of vision’, there are swiftly passing panoramas, a sense of multi-dimensional rush and the fluid interconnections of places, peoples and possibilities (similar to the onrushing images encountered on TV and film). There are a variety of tourist glances like the capturing of sights in passing from
a railway carriage, through the windscreen of a car, a steamship porthole or a camcorder
viewfinder (Larsen 2001). As Schivelbusch argues: ‘The traveller sees...through the apparatus
which moves him through the world. The machine and the motion it creates become integrated
into his visual perception; thus he can only see things in motion’ (Osborne 2000: 168).

The nineteenth century development of the railway was momentous in the development
of this more mobilised gaze. From the railway carriage, the landscape came to be viewed as a
swiftly passing series of framed panorama, a ‘panoramic perception’, rather than something
that was to be lingered over, sketched or painted or in any way captured (Schivelbusch 1986).
Nietzsche famously noted that: ‘Everyone is like the traveller who gets to know a land and its
people from a railway carriage’ (Thrift 1996: 286). The development of the railroad had par-
ticular consequences on the very early development of tourism within the American frontier.
Travellers made specific references to how the railroad annihilated space through its excep-
tional speed that was not fully noticed because of the unusual comfort of the railway carriage.
The railway journey produced an enormous sense of vastness, of scale, size and domination
of the landscape that the train swept through (Löfgren 2000: 3).

Similarly, the view through the windscreen of a car has also had significant consequences
for the nature of the visual ‘glance’, enabling the materiality of the city or the landscape to
be clearly appreciated (Larsen 2001). Elsewhere, the author has elaborated some moments
in the history of automobility, including inter-war motoring in Europe, involving a kind of
‘voyage through the life and history of a land’ (Urry 2000: Chapter 3). The increasingly domes-
ticated middle classes, comfortably and safely located in their Morris Minors, ‘began to tour
England and take photographs in greater numbers than ever before’ (Taylor 1994: 122, and
also see pp. 136–45, on the ‘Kodakisation’ of the English landscape). While in the post-war US,
certain landscapes were substantially altered so as to produce a landscape of leisure ‘pleasing
to the motorist...using the land in a way that would make an attractive picture from the Parkway’
(Wilson 1992: 35; emphasis added). The state turned Nature into something ‘to be appreciated
by the eyes alone’ (Wilson 1992.: 37). The view through the windscreen of a car means that,’the faster we drive, the flatter the earth looks’ (Wilson 1992: 33).

Nevertheless, this corporeality of movement does produce intermittent moments of
physical proximity, to be bodily in the same space as some landscape or townscape, or at a
live event or with one’s friends, family, colleagues, partner or indeed in the company of de-
sired ‘strangers’ (all skiers, or all aged 18–30 and ‘single’, or all bridge players). Much travel
results from a powerful ‘compulsion to proximity’ that makes it seem absolutely ‘necessary’
(Boden and Molotch 1994). Much work entails travel because of the importance of connection,
of the need to meet, to encourage others, and to sustain one’s networks. To be there oneself is
what is crucial in most tourism, whether this place occupies a key location within the global
tourist industry or is merely somewhere that one has been told about by a friend. Places need
to be seen ‘for oneself’ and experienced directly to meet at a particular house of one’s child-
hood or visit a particular restaurant or walk along a certain river valley or energetically climb
a particular hill or capture a good photograph oneself. Co-presence then involves seeing or touching or hearing or smelling or tasting a particular place (see Urry 2000 on the multiple senses involved in mobilities).

A further kind of travel occurs when a ‘live’ event is to be seen, an event programmed to happen at a specific moment. Examples include political, artistic, celebratory and sporting occasions, the last being especially ‘live’ since the outcome (and even the length) may be unknown. Each of these generates intense moments of co-presence, whether for Princess Diana’s funeral, a Madonna concert, a World Expo or the 2000 Sydney Olympics. Each of these cannot be ‘missed’ and they produce enormous movements of people at very specific moments in ‘global cities’ in order to ‘catch’ that particular mega event ‘live’ (Roche 2000). Roche (ibid.: 199) describes the planned mega events as ‘social spatio-temporal “hubs” and “switches” that…channel, mix and re-route global flows’. Such events are spatio-temporal moments of global condensation, involving the peculiarly intense ‘localisation’ of such global events within ‘unique places due to the fact that they staged unique events’. These places therefore have the ‘power to transform themselves from being mundane places…into being these special “host city” sites’ that come to occupy a new distinct niche within global tourism (ibid.: 224).

Such co-presence nearly always involves travel over, and beyond, other places, to get to those visually distinct sites to watch a live event, to climb a particular rock face, to wander ‘lonely as a cloud’, to go white-water rafting, to bungee jump, and so on. These corporeally defined practices are found in specific, specialised ‘leisure spaces’, geographically and ontologically distant from work and domestic sites. Indeed, part of the attraction to these places, where bodies can be corporeally alive, apparently ‘natural’ or rejuvenated, is that they are sensuously ‘other’ to everyday routines and places. Ring (2000: Chapter 4–6) interestingly describes as to how the Alps mountains were developed into such a specialised tourist space during the nineteenth century that the English gentleman could apparently ‘feel properly alive’ when he visited it.

Such places involve ‘adventure’ islands of life, resulting from intense bodily arousal, from bodies in motion, finding their complex way in time and space (see Lewis 2001, on the rock climbing ‘adventurer’). Moreover, some social practices involve bodily resistance, where the body physicalises its relationship with the external world. One typical instance is ‘radial walking’ of the late eighteenth century (Jarvis 1997: chapters 2 and 10), where it took a different meaning: walking as resistance, the ‘freedom’ of the road and gradually the development of leisurely walking as modest acts of rebellion against established social hierarchy. Similarly, the practice of extreme ‘adventure tourism’ in New Zealand demonstrates forms of physical resistance to work and the everyday (Cloke and Perkins 1998). Again, the hedonistic desire to acquire a bronzed body developed through resistance to the Protestant ethic, women’s domesticity and ‘rational recreation’ (Ahmed 2000) could be viewed as part of the process.

So far, the author has regarded the body as the object of ‘viewing’ and body as the mover. But tourism is often about the body as seen—displaying, performing and seducing visitors
with skill, charm, strength, sexuality, and so on. Desmond (1999) indeed notes how common, live performance and bodily display are in the tourism industry. The moving body that is often gazed upon as a ‘spectacular corporeality’ increasingly characterises global tourism. The performing body in dance has become common, such as Maori war-dances, Balinese dance ceremonies, Brazilian samba and Hula dancing in Hawaii.

These examples involve what MacCannell (1973, 1999) terms a ‘reconstructed ethnicity’ and a ‘staged authenticity’. In the Hula staging of bodily display, particular conceptions of the half-native, half-white female bodies are made available for visual consumption. Such dances appear to be ‘real performances’ and their attraction stems from the impression of an unmediated encounter, a genuine performance of an age-old tradition rather than something merely undertaken for the visitor. The performers in such dances become signs of what the tourist audience believes them to be. And in some cases, such dances are such powerful signifiers that the performances have become the dominant signifier of the culture in question. Thus with Maori and Hawaiian cultures, the dance is the culture, swamping all other signifiers and being recognisable across the globe. Desmond (1999: Part 1) outlines the racial and gender history of the making of the female Hula dancer, from the early years of the last century to the current point where 6 million visitors a year are attracted to a naturalistic Eden that is signified by bodily displays of ‘natural’ female Hula dancers. Such a place-image has come to be globally recognised and endlessly re-circulated.

A MOBILE WORLD

The previous section has shown that there are enormously powerful interconnections of ‘tourism’ and ‘culture’ in a mobile world (Rojek and Urry 1997). Not only do tourists travel but so do objects, cultures and images. Also, there appears to be a more general ‘mobile culture’ stemming from a ‘compulsion to mobility’. Kaplan’s (1996) Questions of Travel captures such a culture of mobility. Her extended ‘family’ was located across various continents. Travel and tourism for her was, ‘unavoidable, indisputable, and always necessary for family, love and friendship as well as work’ (ibid.: ix). Kaplan was ‘born into a culture that took the national benefits of travel for granted’ as well as presumed that ‘US citizens [could] travel anywhere they pleased’ (ibid.). Implicit here is that one is entitled to travel since it is an essential part of one’s life. Cultures become so mobile that contemporary citizens (not just Americans!) are thought to possess the right to pass over and into other places and other cultures. Moreover, if household members are forever on the move then distinctions of home and away lose their power. Cultures imply and necessitate diverse and extensive forms of mobility. No other culture, though, matches the recent Hindu Kumbh Mela Festival in Allahabad, in India, on 24 January 2001. It was probably the movement of largest number of people ever to have travelled to a single place within a short period of time; 30–50 million Hindus from all over the world went to the banks of the Ganges.
Indeed, being part of any culture almost always involves travel. Culture developing and sustaining travel takes a number of different forms. There is travel to the culture’s sacred sites, to the location of central written or visual texts, to places where key events took place, to see particularly noteworthy individuals or their documentary record, and to view other cultures so as to reinforce one’s own cultural attachments.

The importance of travel to culture and how cultures themselves travel can be seen from the metaphor of nationality.

Central is the nation’s narrative of itself. National histories tell a story, of people passing through history, a story often beginning in the mists of time (Bhabha 1990). Much of this history of the national traditions and icons will have been ‘invented’ and result as much from forgetting the past as from remembering it (McCrone 1998: Chap 3).

Late nineteenth century Europe was a period of remarkable invention of national traditions. For example, in France, Bastille Day was invented in 1880, La Marseillaise became the national anthem in 1879, 14 July was designated the national feast day in 1880 and Jeanne d’Arc was only elevated from obscurity by the Catholic Church in the 1870s (McCrone 1998: 45–46). More generally, the idea of ‘France’ was extended ‘by a process akin to colonisation through communication (roads, railways and above all by the newspapers) so that by the end of the nineteenth century, popular and elite culture had come together as a result of diverse mobilities’ (ibid.: 46). Key to this was the mass production of public monuments of the nation especially in rebuilt Paris, monuments that were travelled to, seen, talked about and shared through paintings, photographs, films and integration with the European tourism industry.

This collective participation and the more general nation-inducing role of travel had been initiated with the 1851 Great Exhibition at London’s Crystal Palace, the first ever national tourist event. Although the British population was only 18 million, 6 million visits were made to the Exhibition, many using the new railways to visit the national capital for the first time. In the second half of the nineteenth century, similar mega events took place across Europe with attendances at some events reaching 30 million or so (Roche 2000). In Australia, a Centennial International Exhibition was held in Melbourne in 1888, and it is assumed that two-thirds of the Australian population attended it (Spillman 1997: 51). Visitors from home and abroad confirmed Australia’s achievements and characteristics. Particularly important in the genealogy of nationalism have also been the founding of national museums and the development of national artists, architects, musicians, playwrights, novelists, historians and archaeologists (McCrone 1998: 53–55; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998).

The recent period has moreover seen a global public stage emerging upon which almost all nations have to appear, to compete, to mobilise themselves as a spectacle in order to attract large numbers of visitors. This placement particularly operates through mega events such as the Olympics, World Cups and Expos (Harvey 1996). The staging of these international events, premised upon mass tourism and cosmopolitanism, means that national identity is increasingly conceived of in terms of a location within, and on, a global stage. It is this staging that
facilitates both corporeal and imaginative travel to such mega events of the global order, especially the ‘Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture’ (Roche 2000).

Moreover, for many cultures, much of travel entails crossing national frontiers. Households in developing countries develop extensive mobility patterns when their incomes increase. The proliferation of ‘global diasporas’ extends the range, extent and significance of all forms of travel for far-flung families and households. It is said in Trinidad that one can really only be a ‘Trini’ by going abroad. Around 60 per cent of nuclear families have at least one member living abroad (Miller and Slater 2000: 12, 36). Ong and Nonini (1997) also show the importance of mobility across borders in the case of the massive Chinese diaspora that is thought to contain 25–45 million people. Clifford (1997: 247) summarises:

[D]ispersed peoples, once separated from homelands by vast oceans and political barriers, increasingly find themselves in border relations with the old country thanks to a to-and-fro made possible by modern technologies of transport, communication, and labour migration. Airplanes, telephones, tape cassettes, camcorders, and mobile job markets reduce distances and facilitate two-way traffic, legal and illegal, between the world’s places.

Such diasporic travel is also rather open-ended in terms of its temporality. Unlike conventional tourism based upon a clear distinction between ‘home’ and ‘away’, the diasporic traveller often has no clear temporal boundaries as one activity tends to flow into the next.

CONCLUSION

Globalisation has thus ushered in some momentous reconfigurations of the tourist gaze, both for the ever mobile bodies intermittently pausing and for the immobilised bodies that meet in some of these ‘strange encounters’ of the new world order. Such encounters involve exceptional levels of ‘non-interaction’ or urban anonymity especially within the curious ‘walled cities’ known as airports (Gottdiener 2001: 34–35). There has been a massive shift from a more or less single tourist gaze in the nineteenth century to the proliferation of countless discourses, forms and embodiments of tourist gazes now. In a simple sense, we can talk of the globalising of the tourist gaze, as multiple gazes have become core to global culture sweeping almost everywhere in their awesome wake. There are countless mobilities, physical, imaginative and virtual, voluntary and coerced.

Furthermore, there is much less ‘tourism’ per se that occurs within specific and distinct kinds of time–space; there is the ‘end of tourism’ within a much general ‘economy of signs’. There are increasing similarities between behaviours that are ‘home’ and ‘away’ (Shaw et al. 2000: 282). Tourist sites proliferate across the globe as tourism has become massively mediatised, while everyday sites of activity get redesigned in ‘tourist’ mode, as with many themed environments. Mobility is increasingly central to the identities of many young people, to those who are part
Globalising the Tourist Gaze

of diasporas and to many relatively wealthy retired people who can live on the move. And ‘tourism reflexivity’ leads almost every site—however ‘boring’—to be able to develop some niche location within the swirling contours of the emergent global order (see Martin Parr’s spectacular collection of Boring Postcards, 1999).
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Destinations as Experience Stages
A systems view

YEORYIOS STAMBOLIS

INTRODUCTION

Tourist destinations compete (as well as collaborate) in an international arena. They compete in terms of the value they offer to visitors. Competitiveness in tourism, as in any other industry, is defined as the unique potential to provide specific value to specific customer at a specific price. In other words, competitiveness is a coin with two sides: on one side, that is on the user side, it is defined as subjective value, utility, and on the other, it represents the ability of the provider to deliver at an acceptable price, with profit or surplus. Recently, experience has been an explicit element, and in some cases, the main theme of strategies of tourist destinations. An example of a thoroughly designed experience-based tourism strategy is that of Tasmania (Tourism Tasmania Board 2002).

The explicit acknowledgement of experience as the main value attribute of the tourist product provides for a fresh approach to destination evolution, strategy emergence and policymaking. Innovative attempts gain new strategic value, when viewed from a perspective that values experience as a new important attribute. Here, concepts developed in the literature of the theory of the firm and strategic management are adopted in order to address the formulation of destination strategies, as emergent phenomena. The aim is to suggest new departures in the analysis and formulation of destination strategies.

It is argued that the evolution of a destination may be described as a game of ‘co-opetition’, where players have both to lose and to win when they compete or co-operate. Places where the appropriate structures of interactions and institutions (rules) have been developed should be able to perform with greater consistency. Consequently, one should seek for the dynamics of co-opetition that characterise a destination as a platform, where actors engage in the play of tourism.

The rest of the chapter is divided in four parts. In the second part one, the analytical framework of experience-based tourism is established. The intangible nature of tourism is set as a departure for a new view of content and context in destinations, and the tourist industry
as a whole. In the third part focusses on the nature of destinations and the production of the tourist product as a system of activities and resources committed to them by individual actors. The fourth part explores the dynamics of evolution of destinations and of their image and product, and the mechanisms of alignment of the choices made by individual actors in terms of their resource commitment to specific activities and strategic orientations. The concept of culture is extended to include both the perception of the destination as held by stakeholders (in the form of mental maps) as well as the institutional endowment that provides for the ‘soft-wiring’ of the governance of interactions amongst them. Finally, the fifth expands on the issue of mental maps and explores the issues related to the determination of conceived boundaries of the destination as system.

**EXPERIENCE AS A FRAMEWORK FOR NEW TOURISM**

Analysts (Kanellou 2000; Kyriakou 1996) agree that the response of destinations has to focus on the enrichment of content of tourist services in combination with strategies of differentiation and customisation. A strategy of intensification of ‘conventional’ services does not offer significant possibilities for differentiation. Several different responses have been attempted to address this crisis of conventional tourism. New forms of tourism have emerged, characterised by the tendency to depart from mass tourism. Ecotourism (Chirgwin and Hughes 1997; Diamantis 1998; Lew 1998), sport tourism (Green and Chalip 1998), bicycle tourism (Ritchie 1998) and beer tourism (Plummer et al. 2005) are a few attempts of a thematic nature. However, the nature of content is not a closed issue and a comprehensive framework still appears to be lacking.

It is with astonishment that a newcomer to the discipline realises that tourism—as a service industry—has been conceived and analysed along principally tangible terms, rather than intangible, the most striking example being the 4S model (sea, sun, sand and sex). Until now, tourism has principally been concerned with visiting, seeing and living in a different mode of life. Still, as it is shown in the examples in the previous paragraph, though tangible elements of tourism have been prominent, the idea of ‘experiential tourism’ has taken a definite dimension; in fact, by the mid-1990s itself, coinciding with popularisation of alternative tourism forms. Experience has been acknowledged as an important element of the tourist product (Buhalis 2000; Ryan 2002; Trauer and Ryan 2005), but has seldom been addressed explicitly (as in Uriely 2005; or Lehto et al. 2004). Here the explicit acknowledgement of experience themes is viewed upon as a focussing device that facilitates alignment of choices amongst the different stakeholders.

In order to develop a comprehensive framework that addresses both analytical as well as policy issues, the nature of value in the tourist product has to be determined. As argued elsewhere (Stamboulis and Skayannis 2003), the crisis in conventional tourism paradigm is one of content; in other words, of value. Value in the tourism product is experience based, that is, the main criterion that the tourist uses, in order to assess it, is the extent to which he or she has
had a fulfilling experience — with respect to expectations. In this sense destinations are theatres for experience generation and absorption. Experience is the result that emerges through the interaction of destinations’ system of activities with visitors (Ryan 2002). This interaction takes place across time and space and is not confined by destinations’ boundaries.

The new element — experience — somehow adds a comprehensive living adventure to the short time a tourist spends at his destination. In a way, everything is experience: even the 4S model is experience, and is different from the everyday experience of tourists back in their home countries. So in what sense is the element of experience ‘new’?

The novelty lies in the fact that ‘experience’ is designed, intentionally produced (staged), organised, foreseen, calculated, priced and (often explicitly) charged for; it is a core strategic concern as a new value attribute (Pine II and Gilmore 1998: 102). If the capitalist mode of production produces goods and services, which via the market mechanism become commodities to be sold, then ‘experience’ is a new de-materialised commodity that generates increasing returns. The distinction of experience as a separate, valuable commodity offers new perspectives for analysis and strategising. It establishes a new strategy paradigm of ‘New Tourism’.

According to Pine II and Gilmore (1998), the realms of experience may be categorised along two dimensions, ranging from passive to active participation and from absorption to immersion, creating four quadrants where different types of experiences could be placed.

- Entertainment involves passive participation and absorption of customers’ attendance, as in the case of music concerts.
- Education involves active participation and absorption of the customer, such as in sports practice and visits to museums, archaeological sites and seminars.
- Escapist experience involves active participation of customers in religious ceremonies or destinations, working holidays and involvement in projects of NGOs, or even mass tourism in exotic destinations.
- Aesthetic experience occurs when customers are immersed passively — in sightseeing, trekking, swimming, and so on.

In an experience-based exchange the tourist enters into a multifaceted interaction with the actors and the setting of a narrative staged by the local community. Each individual experience is articulated through the four realms in a unique way. A destination should deliver experiences that encompass all four realms, although different points of emphasis may occur. Pine II and Gilmore (1998: 102) argue, ‘Generally, we find that the richest experiences — just as going to Disney World or gambling in a Las Vegas casino — encompass aspects of all four realms, forming a “sweet spot” around the area where the spectra meet’. It is then an issue of customisation: how each destination may meet as wide a diversity of needs and tastes as possible.

In the perspective outlined above, the mapping of the production of tourist value changes. There is a clear shift from a tangible, service-based conceptualisation of the content of the tourist product to an intangible, experience-based content. The roles of infrastructure, context
and content change (Figure 11.1). Infrastructure includes, not just technical and organisational arrangements that enable the delivery of products and services but also those elements that contribute to the enactment of experience (food and lodging facilities, logistics, access, and so on). Context consists of the landscape, services, amenities and activities that make the customer’s access to the experience possible (provision of shelter and hospitality, cuisine, natural spots, environmental, historical and social identity). Content is the experience created by the interaction of travellers with various elements of the destination. The distinction between content and context is one of strategic importance. Experience has always existed in destinations. However it has been taken for granted—a by-product—rather than innovated (created and developed). It is not been themed in an explicit way. Rather it emerges ex-post as a result of the visit of tourists, the use of services and facilities, and the interaction with individuals and organisations. The image, myth or brand name associated with a destination is usually the result of reputation (word of mouth, reports, and so on) and advertising—that is designed and takes place after the destination activities are in place.

**Figure 11.1  Reconstruction of the Tourist Product Value**

---

**DESTINATION AS A SYSTEM**

Experience is the result of the interaction of the tourist with a destination through a variety of activities. Visitors do not consume experience, they ‘live’ it. Interaction is enacted by engaging the tourist in activities such as shopping in London’s high streets; swimming in Cretan beaches;
visiting temples in Greece, India or Mexico, or museums in Paris, South Africa or New York; adventuring in Sahara, the Amazon or Australia’s outback, and so on.

Destinations are unique in as much as each one comprises a distinct set of opportunities of experience. As experience is created through activities, such as, sightseeing, shopping, learning, exercising, riding and the like, it is worthwhile to conceive of them as activity systems, akin to the manner Porter (1996) portrays a firm.

One may engage in different activities (do different things) in different destinations. To the extent that this is the case—a destination can provide for the satisfying enactment of a distinct set of activities or a conventional set of activities in a unique way—there should be a competitive advantage.

It is essential to view destinations as stages of experience. Staging implies planning, but it does not fully determine the activity itself. Improvisation, interpretation and participation are all part of the play; individual actors choose their own course of action within the broader framework. Planning involves the timing of activities, the preparation of the stage (actors, amenities, rules of conduct, information, and so on). In essence, any destination is an ensemble of experience myths and of narratives about them. As Umberto Eco says, ‘Every time we read a book it is a different one’. In an analogy a destination can be visited upon many times and every time a different story unfolds. The destinations’ image (branding) is essentially a product of the narratives of its visitors’ experiences.

Narrative and interpretation about destination(s) usually begin well before the actual visit. Every visitor has diverse expectations from a destination. These are the result of various kinds of information on the destination. Books, movies, songs, documentaries, news items, reports and previous visitors may all be part of a destination’s resource system. They are means of narration about aspects of a destination. They contribute to the formation of visitors’ expectations. The movie ‘Casablanca’, novels, such as those by Hemingway, documentaries on sharks and sea life in general are examples of narratives that have characterised the image of destinations and contributed to the built up of expectations by prospective visitors.

In this sense, a destination should provide the stage for a variety of narratives. These should be complementary (in order to accommodate the priorities of different visitors such as the members of a family), not cancelling out each other (for example, build a theme park on the doorstep of a traditional village) and generate synergies (for example, shopping and theatre in London, sightseeing and swimming in Greece).

All of these activities are based on resources committed to them (Ghemawat 1999). Activities require adequate resources. Some of these may form part of the natural (forests, coastline, gorges, and so on) or historical (monuments, temples and such others) endowments of a place. Others are constructed purposefully in order to facilitate interaction. These include tangible investment in publication materials and promotional literature; public infrastructure like roads, power and telecommunications networks and utilities, museums, and so on, as well as general-purpose and tourism-oriented business installations such as accommodation, restaurants and bars for eating and entertainment, museums for education, boats for rafting, pools for swimming, coaches for touring, bicycles and horses for riding.
A significant part of the resources required is intangible, embodied in people (individually and collectively). Since experience is based on the interaction with the destination, and this takes place mainly through the interaction with people, the competences of individual and collective actors are critical in the delivery of a satisfying and fulfilling experience. A critical set of resources is the people enacting various roles in the destination as well as beyond its boundaries. Tour operation staff, receptionists and waiters, tour guides and escorts and those who work in the back-office (for example, cooks, gardeners, cleaners, drivers) are the motor which run the destination.

At the end of the day, customer satisfaction depends almost entirely on their individual and collective performances. In Tasmania, the state’s tourist strategy explicitly acknowledges the fact that a tourist’s overall appreciation of a visit is the product of these interactions with individuals enacting different roles (Tourism Tasmania Board 2002). In the same manner that every person involved directly or indirectly to a firm’s value chain reflects upon its reputation (which is part of its brand name); every stakeholder living in and around destinations also perform the role as transmitter of positive stories and images about it, thereby identifying themselves as integral part of the destination image.

While tourists may interact with visible activities, there are several other things that contribute to the end result. These activities and resources are principally of a supporting nature: quality control and assurance, design, training, utilities, maintenance are invisible to visitors but essential to the end result. Failure to perform them properly may have devastating effects. Poor service in hotels or restaurants, untrained cooks, rundown bus stations or train services, museums inaccessible to mobility-impaired visitors, inadequate guides and signs may all reflect negatively on the final experience. They are the result of inadequate investment in support activities; investment that should have taken place well in advance.

The systemic nature of destinations is evident by the fact that its performance is emergent. As a whole, destinations’ performance and image is the result of the interactions amongst individual elements, which in turn are the result of actors’ commitments and orientation. No individual actor is solely responsible for it. The end result, in terms of tourist satisfaction from the experience lived, is the product of the combined contributions of all actors. They operate in a context of interaction and interdependence. It is more than their sum, in the sense that each individual commitment may leverage or undermine those made by others. More successful destinations may be characterised by higher degrees of cohesiveness (with respect to the experience myth they are serving), complementarity and (occasionally) differentiation.

A related issue is that of performance measurement and monitoring. It is difficult to measure it by one or a few indices, or allocate shares in performance to individual elements. Performance is multifaceted. It is at the same time economic, environmental, qualitative and quantitative. There are trade-offs between different aspects; for example, present profits versus reputation of quality of service, price versus investment in training and facilities, and a plethora of facilities versus environmental sustainability.
So the question that emerges is how individual actions taken by stakeholders are aligned into a cohesive whole. The actors involved in a destination make decisions on resource allocation according to their individual strategies. The context in which this process should be viewed is put forward next.

**EVOLUTION AND ALIGNMENT**

The impact of the growth of tourism on the natural environment has been well documented (Lorch and Bausch 1995; Loukissas and Skayannis 2001; Manning and Dougherty 1995; Ryan 2002). What has not been so apparent is the change in the activity system and how this coincides with the changes in the repertoire of myths and the experiences of tourists.

The system of activities and resources of a destination is the result of an evolutionary process, involving several actors across the value chain of the tourist product. It is important to comprehend, both the process (system) of provision–production of the tourist product, as well as the processes, structures and mechanisms that lead to its formation and the accompanying strategy.

The intensively interactive nature of the experiencing process reminds us that the process involves two sides. First, the tourist is invited to partake in the experiences provided. This is not a simple, standardised offer. Each combination of experiences–activities offered is a unique story about the destination, a narrative (a view about it) told by tourist agents, guides, former visitors, local actors, and so on. This is an ongoing process, where tourists learn about the destination and destinations learn (collectively) about tourists.

Second, this is a process of interactive learning (Lundvall 1992). It bears great significance for the balance of power between destinations and intermediaries (Stamboulis and Skayannis 2003). Both destinations and intermediaries embark on a virtuous spiral, where interaction with consumers results in the accumulation of knowledge, which materialises in better content creation and integration (as opposed to information processing), further enhancing trust and reputation (Figure 11.2).

Mykonos is a Greek island, whose evolution as a destination provides useful insight in this process. It emerged as a destination during the 1960s, when the international jet-set and the avant-gardes discovered the island for its unique picturesque setting—a perfect combination of sea, sun and traditional architecture—and the local hospitality. The islanders in those days were making their living from fishing, agriculture and remittances from the relatives residing the West.

The image of summer life in Greek islands became very popular, bringing more tourists to Mykonos and the rest of the Cyclades islands (not to all the islands, just the larger and more accessible ones). Along with other islands, Mykonos also transformed very fast from an elitist destination into a mass tourism destination. However, it still preserves many images of niche or high-end destination. At the same time, another group of people, low budget backpackers,
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also discovered the pure character of the natural and built environment in Greek islands. Hippie colonies were set up in several islands, some operating all year long. Year after year, more young Europeans and Americans discovered the Greek island experience and most revisited the islands several times.

In the process, three development trajectories emerged in the Mykonos island. The first continued on the path of the elitist, closed-club images that is reproduced by the populist and tabloid press; expensive resorts, parties and an image of exclusiveness for the favoured few. The second has been an imitation of mass consumption that has attracted mainly young people from northern and western Europe. The third has focussed on family tourism, focussing on the exploitation of the natural environment and the historic endowment dispersed in and around Greece.

The changes that have been outlined here took place in tandem with the evolution of the activities and the resources allocated to them. While the local production system was stressed for resources in order to provide for the demand generated, investments were directed (mainly from outsiders) to accommodation and food facilities, as well as supporting and complementary activities (tourist books and guides have been written and translated in several languages, museums have been built, training schools for tourism-related occupations have been set up, and so on).

The case of Mykonos is not dissimilar from that of many destinations (islands, ski resorts, cultural sites and such others) all over the world. The most striking issues stressed here are the following: the myth or myths associated with a destination evolve, as and when resource commitments of the actors involved change. They in turn respond to perceived opportunities

![Figure 11.2 The Virtuous Cycle of User-based Interactive Learning](Source: Stamboulis and Skayannis (2003).)
and expectations. Thus, individual commitments are taking place within a wider framework of multilateral ones.

In the context of Mykonos, process interaction and interdependence are evident, both vertically and horizontally. Vertically, it involves exchange and learning between tourists and destination actors, as well as between actors along the value chain, in a user–producer interaction continuum. As the activity system evolves, the perception of prospective visitors about what to expect changes. It is usually an evolutionary spiral that takes place, where destination actors react to tourist behaviour (spending, visiting, satisfaction, and so on) and visitors revise their perception according to their experience. In some cases discontinuity may occur, either due to a major commitment by one or more existing or new actors, or because of a natural or social upheaval (for example, a tsunami, an earthquake, an environmental accident or a social crisis in the tourists’ home countries).

Horizontally, there is indirect interdependence rather than direct interaction. Interaction also exists but it is of an indirect nature. Economies of agglomeration provide for economies of scale and scope. Individual performance is contingent upon the enactment of complementary commitments from other actors in the destination. Restaurants will survive or thrive depending on whether hotels have been built that will accommodate potential clients, as well as on the general reputation that the place has created in terms of quality and diversity as a result of the performance of each restaurant individually. Private business depends on the provision of services by the local authorities, such as transport, water and waste processing.

The process may be viewed as a repeated co-opetition game (Nalebuff and Brandenburger 1996) where collaboration—mostly tacit—and competition take place simultaneously. Actors actually collaborate when they decide to commit to the deployment of resources on activities that are complementary to those of other actors. Complementarity may range from mere contribution to the development of economies of agglomeration, or to the provision for activities that build upon and support those of other actors (for example, a children’s playground close to a surfing beach). It may also involve the coexistence of multiple myths and narratives about the destination. Destinations may be conceived as platforms, where various experience-narratives are taking place at once. At the same time, actors as well as experience-narratives compete for the attraction of visitors and the extraction of value. They compete for a larger share in the pie as well as strategic positioning, in order to control the evolution of the destination.

Then, the dynamics that arise in a scenario like the above, present a great variety: complementarities and competition; innovation as well as continuity and integrity; and value creation and benefit sharing. In many respects, the destination story presented here resembles that of high-tech sectors, such as the cases of the ‘wintel’ platform in personal computer, video games, mobile telephony, or such process in other industries like automobiles.

At every step, stakeholders face a prisoner’s dilemma with respect to the providers of their complementories (Nalebuff and Brandenburger 1996). Should they seek to extend their control and their share in the returns or would such a move invite unwelcome responses?
Such unwelcome responses may be either under-investment in complements or attempts to strike back by engaging in a fight for control of the game. Hamel and Prahalad (1994) have argued that breaking from the dominant mentality in an industry may provide the basis for a competitive advantage. In the case of tourism, this occurs when individual commitments are aligned in order to support a new or differentiated myth or experience-narrative.

What is it then that holds destinations together as systems and what may contribute to their breakdown? In order to understand this, one should look closer at the process of commitment. Commitment is based on expectations and past experiences. The latter is to a degree, commonly held by destination stakeholders. The former tends to be also of a common nature, as mentalities (worldviews or mental models more accurately) are shared and collectively developed in a place (Senge 1990: 174–204). In other words, the degree to which actors develop a shared understanding of their situation determines the sustainability and the cohesiveness of the destinations myths. The dominant mentality in the stakeholder community operates as a business model (Magretta 2002). It is the narrative that drives the commitment of individual actors. So the myths about the experience expectations are also addressed to the stakeholders in the destination. They operate as a focussing mechanism, enabling alignment in the same fashion that branding functions inwardly, in a firm.

This game of co-opetition is also embedded in a web of institutional arrangements that function as trust regulating mechanisms. Maskell (1996: 8–9) argues that alignment is easier to realise and sustain when elements of a ‘negotiated democracy’ are in place. A central role in this is enacted by institutions that act as trust enhancing mechanisms. Such mechanisms aim to create consensus creating processes, re-allocate the cost of transition, raise the cost of and punish opportunistic behaviour, and support and encourage participation and involvement. In short, it may be said that formal and informal institutions, together with the shared mental models about a destination, form the backbone of the entrepreneurial and industrial culture that drives and channels individual and collective actions.

**The Question of Boundary**

Different actors may have different views of the reality of a destination and the roles of others. Let us take for example the case of Greek islands. During the first period of tourism development, tourism had been identified mostly with backpackers and ‘island-hopping’. The core activities were provision of food and lodging. The issue of transport was only of marginal importance. As tourism grew, two things happened. First, destinations came to be more dependent on transportation, and second, the profile of the tourists changed (more family-based, higher income, and so on). Consequently, the expectations and demand on the level of services provided changed. This concerned not only the core activities but also complementary ones such as transport. Travellers demanded more reliable and comfortable services and preferred destinations that were serviced by adequate providers.
Destinations where adequate infrastructure existed (ports, airports) could embark on a virtuous circle: better transport service contributed to making the destination more favourable for investment in tourism and vice versa. These activities are more than complements and constitute part of an indivisible experience. Indeed, there is a threshold limit to transport development and when it is crossed, the service quality will begin to fall, thereby, undermining the attractiveness of any destination. For instance, one may embark on a boat because it is expected as very much a part of the destination experience, but may not prefer a ride if the water quality is poor or the water body is crammed with boats. Again, preference for a destination would often also depend on the satisfaction level expected of travel between the place of origin and the destination.

It is also important to note that for a tourist, the price of the destination is to a large extent indivisible because it is the total cost of the vacation that will weigh against the prospect of a tourist experience. Providers of complements indeed compete for their share in that price. The overall structure of ownership may be important here. One should, for instance, notice that what distinguishes Crete from other tourist destinations in Greek islands is its successful liner companies owned by a great number of Cretans (the term used in Greece is Companies of Broad Public Base). Taking into account the fact that their services were also critical for the other sectors of the local economy, people viewed the income from their shares in these companies in the context of the broader system and acknowledged its importance for their other activities. Thus, although they have monopoly in their routes, their fares were significantly low and services well above any other destination. Travelling to Crete, to and fro by sea, for a weekend has been a common practice and a decision taken with much greater ease than for any other destination. This level of service has been carried in other destinations, where the shipping companies have been operating, further expanding the islands reputation for quality of service.

Another example that may be more closely related to the experience produced by the interaction of the destination itself with tourists is that of energy. In most Greek islands energy is supplied exclusively through underwater cables or by diesel-powered generators, operated by the Public Power Company (now also publicly traded in the Athens Stock Exchange). During the peak of the tourist period, islands—especially the ones most popular with tourists—face serious power shortage problems. Local politicians and communities have been seeking solutions to the problem along the same technological trajectory (either more underwater cables or new power stations).

Two issues seem to have been escaping their mental models. First, power supply is a critical part of the activity system—albeit not a core one—claiming a share of the revenue, irrespective of how big the revenue is. As things stand, power is not a part of the tourist product picture, not explicitly paid for and not affecting its perceived value and price, but still demands its share. Second, the mode of power supply affects the landscape and visitors’ perceptions of it. As the system grows, conflicts emerge. The example can be seen in some islands in Greece,
where the local communities demand that high-voltage transmission cables run underground, as in the past, rather than running aerially. They cite environmental and health hazards as reasons, but would simultaneously maintain that it may undermine the islands’ image as a ‘natural landscape’.

Trapped in a mental mode that assumes that power is supplied from the outside (and outsiders, that is, the state or big business), alternative solutions of power generation and ownership escape their minds. The failure to acknowledge energy supply as part of the destinations activity system inhibits them from meticulously examining how it affects the tourist product and its value chain. Are there environmentally conscious tourists who may pay attention to the way their air-conditioning is powered? Would they be willing to discriminate in favour of environmentally responsible destinations? Would these destinations be telling a different story about themselves? Would this story be more interesting if the locals are directly involved? If locally produced goods such as food and clothes tell an interesting story, could there not be a case for a distinct local story about how the wind generators or small hydro-plants came into existence? And, how those provide power to the community? Or, could a destination tell a story about a modern bridge, which is as interesting as the one on an old windmill? Are there stories (as well as photographs or the like) that the visitors could take back home?

Hall (1999) stresses the need for an explicit and holistic framework in to assess activities such as transportation of tourists. What emerges from the two examples is that the explicit acknowledgement of the activities contributing to the production of the tourist product is only the first step. The next step might be dealing with the issues of ownership and control of such complementary activities. Conflicts about resource commitment and investment in capacity and quality, once identified, bring to the front the issue of industrial structure and the use of monopoly or oligopoly power. The question that arises is whether the service providers share a common view about their role with the stakeholders in the destination itself.

A further step may be taken once experience is identified as the core element of value in the tourist product. Then the need emerges to make explicit and apparent how every aspect of the destination contributes to it. To a degree, experience is based on reflections upon narratives about the totality of the destination. They involve value-ridden accounts about people told by people through various channels (guides, Internet sites, local people, professionals, books, novels, previous visitors, and so on). How explicit has the story of the Cretan sea link or an island’s energy system been to all actors involved? How apparent has it been to visitors? Is it a part of the island’s public image, of its brand name?

**Conclusion**

Setting experience at the centre of the discussion on tourism provides for a new and prolific departure for exploring important aspects of destination strategy formulation. It brings the intangibility of tourism to the forefront and provides for a tourist-based assessment and
valorisation of the tourist product. The element of culture and communication is made explicit. Destinations are platforms for experience living, exchange of narratives and exploration of myths. Culture is a critical element not just as part of the tourist product but significantly as part of the evolutionary process of the formation of destination identities and products. Its inward function as a focussing device extends from destination narratives to business models (individual and collective). It acts as a regulator of the co-opetitive game stakeholders are engaged in.

In the form of mental models, culture embodies the dynamics of evolution and change in strategic orientation. It is recognised as a compelling force in the alignment of stakeholders’ actions as well as the opening of new strategic possibilities. Generating and enacting narratives of experience myths is a dynamic capability that is the basis for sustainable competitive advantage of destinations.

Competitive sustenance requires that ‘experience myths’ are embedded in the social realities of destinations. They cannot simply be enforced upon destinations. The capability to enact experience myths depends on the competence of destinations as a whole to bring together different stakeholder perspectives and align their individual choices in a way that will facilitate the resolution of conflicts and to create new opportunities. The challenge would then lie in transforming a culture that views the destination economy as mere competition platforms to the one that acknowledges and realises synergies, mutual dependence, and social and environmental limits to growth.

NOTES

1. I am indebted to Dr Sutheeshna Babu. S for this as well as for several other observations.
2. This took place soon after a tragic sea accident that claimed the lives of passengers and highlighted the significance of the quality of the connection with mainland Greece.
3. Other destinations have also mimicked the Cretan example, but not with the same level of success.
4. However, since the 1990s, when the companies went public in the Athens Stock Exchange, their shareholder structure has changed and other competitors have entered the market. It remains to be seen how this will affect their behaviour towards the local economy.
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SECTION-C
EMERGING DEVELOPMENT PARADIGMS
Tourism Development and Its Emerging Paradigms

A synthesis

SUTHEESHNA BABU. S

INTRODUCTION

The question of what represents ‘development’ underwent drastic interpretations in the last few decades, moving away from the economic growth perspectives, encompassing the ‘quality of life’ paradigm, which took account of other aspects of modern living environment—economic, cultural, political and environmental components. Broadening of the concept of development, both in the general and tourism domain has been attempted by scholars with composite measures, using above indicators of modern living to benchmark development. Despite these, the eclectic nature of the term makes it one of the most problematic areas to understand. It is viewed variably as a philosophy, a state or stage, a cultural construct, a set of objectives and processes or a state of mind that transcend notional boundaries. Development concept is best summarised by Elliott (1999) in Sharpley (2002), who states that it ‘relates to all parts of the world at every level, from individual to global transformations’.

Many argue that development due to its ambiguous and elusive nature defies definitions (Cowen and Shenton 1996), although not for want of efforts. Most traditional theories that were used to delineate development process have fallen into doubt. Indeed, the ‘post-development’ school that emerged in the 1990s has even gone to the extent of arguing that the notion of development is fundamentally flawed, inherently unjust and has never worked (for details see Rahnema and Bawtree 1997). To them, development has grown obsolete (Sachs 1992) and therefore, either should be simply abandoned or replaced with a less mechanistic, prescriptive approach (Rahnema 1997). Perhaps, the spectrum of thinking on development prevailing currently may be better suited to revisit the fast emerging paradigms in tourism as well because of two reasons: first, because of its prominence as a socio-economic activity in the present time; second, the contradictions in the ongoing dialogue on development are equally reflective in tourism as well. This chapter begins with a brief sketch of the growth of tourism, particularly international tourist arrivals and earnings at the global and regional levels. Subsequently, the discussion moves on to briefly detailing the evolution of development paradigms in tourism and then attempts to
delineate the conflicting strands of thinking on sustainability, and tourism consumption and production to contextualise the contemporary tourism development.

**Evolving Pattern of International Tourism**

Tourism has grown into a phenomenon today transgressing many established notional boundaries of class and region, and to an appreciable extent ethnicity; unlike in the past (until Second World War) when it was elitist, selective and practiced by few leisure classes. Such an arguably mass democratisation of contemporary recreation and tourism can be seen as a by-product of multi-level institutional changes, technological progression, changing lifestyles, and perceptions and competition. In fact, the influences of these factors has been such that it has revolutionalised the very meaning and form of leisure, recreation and tourism practices in the post-World War II world. Some changes which are being reflected in tourism include: first, an incredible increase recorded in the international tourist traffic and the revenue earned. As the volume of arrivals increased from 25.9 million in 1950 to 763 million in 2004, the earnings from these also demonstrated a considerable increase to a record USD 623 billion in 2003 from just USD 2.1 billion in 1950 (UNWTO 2004). (See Tables 12.1 and 12.2.) A close study of these figures also reveals that the growth in the receipts has been higher and more consistent compared to arrivals. Further, the data compiled by United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) since 1950 reveals the global distribution pattern of tourism. For instance, while tourism continued to be spatially concentrated with Europe remaining as the major region of tourist activities, the relative degree of dispersal from the traditional tourism hubs of the developed core to ‘pleasure peripheries’ has been gradually increasing (Tables 12.1 and 12.2). Perhaps, the most striking feature demonstrated over the last few decades has been the fast growth experienced in the Asia-Pacific region, especially in the last two decades, and the UNWTO–Vision 2020 projection statistics indicates that the growth rate in these regions will continue to be relatively much higher.

**Table 12.1 Regional Share of International Tourist Arrivals, 1950–2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>278.2</td>
<td>445.8</td>
<td>685.5</td>
<td>763.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 12.2 Regional Share of International Tourist Receipts, 1950–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Share of regions (%)</th>
<th>World receipts in USD billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Second, the developing nations presently receive over 40 per cent of the international tourist traffic and UNWTO (2006) data showed that their proportion has increased from 28.6 per cent in 1990 to over 40 per cent in 2005. While the statistics is suggestive of the promising growth in the developing nations, a review of literature suggests that various dimensions of the fast growing tourism and its impacts in these regions have not been adequately documented, examined or understood. A latest essay confirms this and states that little research has been carried out on the impact of large-scale mainstream tourism in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) (Jenkins 2006). Miguela Mena’s chapter in this volume provides some valuable insights on major dimensions of tourism development in the developing nations. Third, though the significance of domestic tourism is neither measured nor understood in definite terms world over (Aramberry 2004), the latest estimation by UNWTO (2004) reveals its volume to be somewhere around seven to 10 times greater than international tourism. An interesting case in this context is India, where the size of domestic tourism was more than 360 million in 2004, compared to just about 3.5 million international visitors (Department of Tourism 2005) in the same year.

Fourth, while the leading tourist receiving countries continue to fall within the European and North American continents, of late, countries such as China and Hong Kong (China) have emerged as important global destinations with fourth and seventh rank, respectively in 2004 (UNWTO Statistical Highlights 2005). A reflection of this fast growth can be seen in the share of global tourist traffic to Asia-Pacific region in the same period (Tables 12.1 and 12.2). Further, at the country level, UNWTO data also points to a very high growth rate in many emerging countries compared to the global average as well as those of many leading country destinations and most of these countries happen to fall in the developing part of the world. It is seen then that while the average global growth in arrivals during 1995–2003 stood at 3.2 per cent; the Middle East, Asia and Pacific, and Africa grew at 9.2, 5.5 and 4.7 per cent, respectively. Some individual countries namely Zambia, Tanzania, El Salvador, Cuba, Cambodia, Iran, Lao PDR and most countries in the Middle East grew at an average rate of more than 10 per cent per annum. What is also striking is the very high growth rates in most countries in Eastern Europe, particularly in Armenia and Croatia where the annual growth figures are more than 20 per cent.
ROLE OF TOURISM IN DEVELOPMENT

Most often, the question is ‘why’ tourism to the destination countries mainly centres around economic considerations, but of late, as Pearce (1989) has pointed out, the social and environmental aspects have also been recognised as important themes. A review of major writings suggests that while on the one hand, tourism has been lauded for its economic and social contributions, on the other hand, sufficient arguments have also been advanced to show quantitatively and qualitatively that tourism, indeed, has brought in many irreversible damages to destination’s socio-economic environment, more particularly in the developing world. Furthermore, the euphoric ‘smokeless tourism’ has turned into a harmful activity, adversely affecting the environment like most other industries, though not to the same extent. It can also be seen that the prophetic debate on the advantages of mass versus alternative tourism of the 1980s is presently struggling to distinguish their distinctive identities and ideological positions because not only are their boundaries blurring over the years but also the development dynamics have been shaping and reshaping the alternative character of tourism forms in the process.

Another major reason cited in the literature favouring tourism is related to its scope as a tool for regional development and to bring down the inequalities among regions (Oppermann 1992, cited in Oppermann 1993: 541; Telfer 2002b: 121). As Christaller (1963) and Malecki (1997) have suggested, tourism is an attractive socio-economic development tool for those regions where other economic options or opportunities are scarce. Many influential regional development models have been advanced since Schumpeter’s (1934) work but the issues continue to broadly revolve around the appropriateness of the models, inequalities and nature of beneficiaries, and role of the state in order to be sustainable (see Blair 1995 for a detailed account of models). And many of them have been contextualised within tourism for examining both merits and demerits, viz., growth pole and trickle-down/economic integration (Kemper 1979; Sinclair and Stabler 1997; Weaver and Oppermann 2000), diffusion/spatio-temporal models (Miossec 1977 and Gormsen 1981, cited in Pearce 1989: 17; Oppermann 1993), ‘enclave’ model of Britton (1982), and of recently, cluster model of Porter (1990, 1998) and industrial district model of Hjalager (2000). The most influential among these in recent years could be Porter’s (1998) model, which used the ‘California wine cluster’, that is a tourism and food component as a detailed example along with several tourism related clusters in his treatise on cluster theory. Jackson and Murphy (2002) tested cluster theory in the context of ‘New World’ tourism destinations and then suggested that it is a suitable analytical framework and the destinations are likely to be quite receptive to working cooperatively to develop their products.

In recent years, two main shifts in the regional development dialogue could be observed. First, as Malecki (1997) observed, the conventional regional development models and policies of firms, regions and nations that focus more on the capital–labour production relations and responsiveness of the state are progressively moving towards integrating them with the
principles of ‘economic competitiveness’ propounded by Porter (1990) through cluster theory. This reflects a shift in the regional development thinking since the clusters, whether geographic or activity-based, arguably have a greater role to play in competition in the fast emerging globalised and knowledge-based economy. Second, from the primary focus of regional tourism development initiatives within a country (Pearce 1989) to growing collaborative efforts by national alliances such as the European Union (EU), Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), South Africa Development Community (SADC), Association of Caribbean Nations (ACN), and so on, are emerging to develop and promote tourism within themselves and also to strengthen regional competitiveness at global level (Hall and Page 2000; Timothy and Teye 2004; Wilson 1996).

**Development Paradigms in Tourism**

The evolution of development theories since the Second World War can be seen as fast, divergent and equally conflicting. Major schools of thoughts and their proponents sought to establish their dominance over the prevailing thinking and perpetuation but eventually succumbed to the contradictions from within and/or challenges from new streams of thinking, thereby either relegating their position to the margins or resolving the contradictions to remain noticeable and in reckoning. But, with the passage of time since the War, one has encountered a succession of major development paradigms, which were best explained in the works of Todaro (1997) and Brohman (1996). By adopting the works done by them, Telfer (2002a) attempted a temporal sketching of the concomitant existence/succession of major development paradigms. According to this, during the 1950s and the 1960s, the modernisation and dependency school of thoughts broadly dominated the global development dialogue. However since the early 1970s, these paradigms were weakened with the emergence of two diametrically opposite schools—the economic neo-liberalism and alternative development.

As Telfer observed, development theory and tourism have evolved along similar lines since the Second World War and have a shared focus. Reflective of this, theorisation and modelling of tourism development have been major contentious issues and efforts to build consensus around a broadly acceptable paradigm found only little success, possibly owing to the extreme nature of ideological positions. Perhaps, the classic attempt to contextualise the influence of the major development ideologies in tourism was made by Jafari (2001) in his pursuit of tracking down the scientification process in tourism. This resulted in delineation of four distinct platforms or philosophical positions in tourism, chronologically—from advocacy to cautionary, adaptancy and the knowledge-based platforms. However, he was cautious to state that each position has emerged without being replaced and indeed all four positions coexist today.

The advocacy platform, dominant during the 1950s and the 1960s, emanated from individuals, firms and institutions who were enthused mainly about the economic prospects of
the ‘smokeless’ tourism business (Davis 1968; Peters 1969). It coincided with the powerful modernisation project, which argued that tourism development diffuses from the focal points (growth poles) of development, usually urban areas, to more traditional, less developed rural peripheries in the form of trickle-down benefits. Interestingly, Weaver (2004: 511) noted: ‘[B]eyond its association with modernization theory, the advocacy group has come to be associated with virtually any support for mass tourism that derives from laissez-faire market forces.’ The advocates were either not much aware of the potential conflicts of tourism development or preferred to overlook it. The emergence of critical research and of the cautionary platform can be seen as strong responses to the rise of mass tourism on a global scale and the contradictions associated with its development (for example, Turner and Ash 1975; De Kadt 1979). Their works viewed mass tourism as bad and the efforts were to highlight mainly the damaging sides of tourism development—economically, socio-culturally and environmentally—particularly in the ‘peripheral destinations’ and have set the agenda for serious enquiries in tourism development.

The growing concerns in the contradictions of tourism development, particularly the global level organisation and operation of mass tourism, and the magnitude of its adverse impacts have made the anti-modernisation critics describe tourism as a neo-colonial expression of the leisure class in the developed core, thereby perpetuating a dependency syndrome. Jafari termed this phase of progression in the tourism knowledge being manifested in the 1970s as the ‘cautionary platform’. The notable application of dependency model in tourism, rooted in the structuralist school, can be found in the works of Muller and Britton. Muller (1979) argued that the dominance of the multinational corporations have lead to the underdevelopment of the Third World, whereas for Britton (1982), these corporations mostly based in the First World were able to create, coordinate and market the components of the industry to develop tourism product. The eventual outcome was of perpetuating unequal and interdependent patterns of development. Today, as before, the cautionary position ranges from outright rejection of the ‘advocacy’ to calculated pronouncements about undesirable consequences of tourism (Jafari 2001). Jafari further stated that in the height of the claims and counter-claims by these platforms in the 1970s, a situation was created that was potentially not conducive to fruitful dialogues or discourses.

The culmination of the cautionary platform, according to Weaver and Lawton (2002) cited in Weaver (2004: 511), coincided with the introduction of Butler’s (1980) destination life-cycle model, which postulated that continued laissez-faire tourism development may eventually result in the decline of the destination if no re-mediation is undertaken. Butler indeed has prominently brought out the notion of equity, distribution, autonomy, progressive policy and institutional interventions in destination development. Perhaps, the polarised debates between these platforms, revolving mainly around the ‘impacts’, made many to begin the search for tourism forms with lesser impacts that are more inclusive and appropriate. The eventual outcome of this was the emergence of alternative forms to mass tourism, which were construed
as being more authentic, least harmful, community-focused and equilibrium-based tourism development. This proposition fostered the formation of Jafari’s third position in the 1980s—the adaptancy platform. Adapted tourism, regardless of its nature or scope, Jafari argued, is presented as an informed set of alternative options to the present mass, commercialised, out-of-control and hard forms of tourism, practiced almost everywhere. Incidentally, the logic of alternative tourism happens to have its pedigree in the global movement of the 1980s that aimed to bring the ‘environment’ as central to development dialogue. However, for the critiques, alternative tourism overlooked a number of ‘fundamental truths’ (McKercher 1993) of tourism, such as the exogenous factors and the behavioural patterns of such tourist consumers. According to them, it provided only alternative forms and not solutions to the problems of mass tourism that continue to dominate the tourism scenario.

But, what remained less discussed and conspicuous was the coveted but powerful influence of the neo-liberal economic practices in tourism. Indeed, it was proliferated in the shadow of the dominant alternative tourism dialogue as many governments and financial institutions continued to pursue these policies with focus on competitive exports and the structural adjustment programmes (SAPs). For instance, though the World Bank did not have a dedicated tourism department after 1978, its funding continued unabated through its organs like International Finance Corporation (IFC) and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), as revealed in the study by Pryce (1998). Also worth citing in this context is one of the pioneering works by Dieke (1995), focussing on the relationship between tourism and SAPs of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank covering 29 African countries. The study noted that governments in Africa have permitted an increased role of private sector in the development of tourism, recognising the role of market in the efficient use of resources.

The emergence of the ‘knowledge-based platform’ in the last decade of the twentieth century was in response to developing deeper understanding of tourism and its interconnectivities—a critical dimension that the previous positions failed to address. This platform, Jafari (2001) maintains, mainly occupied by the academic research community, aimed at positioning itself on a scientific foundation while maintaining bridges with the other three platforms. It also aimed at forming a knowledge landscape that upholds objectivity. He argued that the preoccupation of previous platforms with either the impacts of tourism (advocacy and cautionary) or of the forms of tourism (adaptancy) has constrained a more holistic treatment of the subject of tourism, thereby impeding the formation of a scientific body of knowledge. These platforms also failed to address fully the complexities in the fast growing and global encircling mega tourism industry due to their preoccupation with respective ideological positions. Due attention was also not given to the fact that tourism industry is going to remain ever more influential and that mass tourism will continue to dominate the business scenario. Given this background, knowledge platform could be viewed as more engaging of the previous positions collectively, enabling to move closer towards achieving sustainable tourism development. This, in the process, will also address the concern of carving out a definite identity for tourism as a subject and
industry that awaits more engaged enquiries, eventually contributing to strengthen the scientific and consolidation process of knowledge creation in tourism.

IS THE CORE—PERIPHERY PARADIGM BLURRING?

The core–periphery theorisation of the political economy school in tourism coincides with the critical examination of tourism development that began in the late 1970s. The main theorists belonging to this tradition (Bryden 1973; De Kadt 1979; Perez 1980; Britton 1982) envisaged tourism as an expression of ‘metropolitan’ hegemony over the ‘peripheral’ countries by making the latter dependent on capital and tourists from the former. The study of Britton is noteworthy, which elaborately demonstrates the manner in which the Third World nations are exploited by the metropolitan capital enterprises that organise and control the nature and scope of tourism development in the former. In addition to the capital and ‘tourist consumer’ dependence, critics have also argued that such tourism can be likened to a form of ‘cultural imperialism’ (Shivji 1975) or the ‘hedonistic face of neocolonialism’ (Crick 1989 in Sharpley 2002: 270). International tourism has also been portrayed as one amongst the numerous mediums through which consumerist values of the metropolitan core are communicated to the peripheries.

In the background of the above theorisations of the global tourism system, how should the ‘core–periphery’ debate in tourism be contextualised in the present scenario? The statistics of the international tourist arrivals and the earnings from them reveals that few countries in the traditional tourism peripheries begin to look like ‘semi-cores’ in their own right. Then, as Brown (2006) asked, has the notion of core and periphery lost its salience as a means of characterising today’s tourism? For Brown, the answer could be, perhaps, both ‘yes’ and ‘no’ — that is, the concept of core and periphery in tourism has both changed and stayed at the same time, when viewed from different tourism-specific and socio-economic development angles. What seems to have happened is a blurring of the core–periphery distinction at the global level, accompanied by its sharpening at the regional and national level. But, while agreeing to some extent with the proposition of Brown on blurring of core–periphery structure of tourism at the global level, it would not be logical to infer that the meaning of core–periphery analytical framework has become irrelevant in tourism because the ‘traditional core’ of tourism has not demonstrated any noticeable change in undermining their position as the core when we look at the actual volume of tourism — both in revenue and arrival terms (Tables 12.1 and 12.2). These cores, primarily the western Europe and the US, continue to be the major regions for tourism activities. An arguable aberration to the ‘tourism core’ conception is perhaps only China, whereas most part of the traditional peripheries/continents such as South America, Africa and most of Asia or the individual nations do not mirror the so-called blurring of their peripheral status.

Therefore, any call for abandoning of core–periphery analytical paradigm, whether at the global level or the individual country level, would have the risk of undermining the understanding of the working of global system. The global system of tourism is organised
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predominantly around the existing core, whether in terms of the tourists, earnings from tourism or the capital flow or tourism corporations, thereby maintaining the control structure of the system without much meaningful dilution. Despite the continued prevalence of such macro-structural organisation, the critics may still argue the core-periphery structure as an overly generalised view of international tourism—a valid reason for them to discard this analytical tool. However, some scholars (Bianchi 2002; Brown 2006), while acknowledging the continued relevance of the paradigm, suggest that a better conceptualisation would be to bring the debate more at the national level. The reason, according to Brown is that the welfare state systems are being eroded piecemeal in the North and remain unestablished in the South, thereby the macro-perspective becomes insufficient to explain the contradictions. Whereas, Bianchi’s concern was that crucial aspects of local/regional economic development were overlooked and not theorised. Nevertheless, he did acknowledge that the neo-colonial model could highlight some of the major structural inequalities between markets and destinations in the international tourism political economy. Therefore, one could still find the meaning and scope of core-periphery paradigm not being lost totally. Nevertheless, the attempt to revisit the core-periphery analytical frame is on the wane owing to the dominance of the neo-liberal positions in the realm of academics and policy-making, as well as due to changing agenda of researchers in the form of research funding, networking or growing tendency to be the part of dominant ideological positions and research paradigms of the present.

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT DIALOGUE AT CROSSROADS?

While the above perspectives continue to serve as main frameworks for the researchers in their pursuit of creating critical knowledge and discourses, in recent years, two trends are demonstratively being found: first, the continuance of the antithetical economic liberalism on the one side and the call for the alternative development on the other. The second trend is reflective of the growing call for evolving development models by integrating the positive elements of divergent models (Tefler 2002a). The debates around sustainable development perhaps best reflect the prevailing tension between diverse perspectives. The following section, after attempting a brief sketch of emerging argumentations on sustainable development, makes an attempt to arrive at a convergent perspective of this debate.

Sustainable tourism, according to Jafari’s (2001) tourism evolution theory, represents the latest stage, namely ‘knowledge platform’, which embodies a greater knowledge and understanding of tourism’s processes underpinned by contributions from a variety of disciplines. Some analysts like Skolimowski (1995: 69) maintain that ‘sustainability strikes a middle ground between more radical approach . . . it is radical yet not offensive’. But, in reality, even after more than two decades of debate, the question of feasibility of the sustainable development remains inconclusive. Reflective of this, a vast and diverse body of tourism-specific knowledge is available that contextualises the ongoing debate in sustainable development.
A major criticism against sustainability is its ambiguity, both in its objectives and inherent processes, thereby defying precise definition (Sharpley 2002). Sharpley contended that concentrating on issues such as the rate and scale of development, the types of tourists targeted and the degree of local control, not only suggest that ‘true sustainable tourism development’ is unachievable in practice but has also resulted in a highly polarised and value-laden perspective on tourism development. According to Weaver (2004), the ‘oxymoronic’ nature of the term sustainable tourism and its amenability to appropriation by the supporters of various ideologies allows it to be used to represent and support any model of development. In addition, there are many barriers that act as impediments to achieve sustainable development. First, the ‘lack of fit’ between tourism in general and the concept of sustainable development and also the consistent failure to explore the theoretical link between these. Second, the complex nature of the existence of tourism, and its direct and indirect interconnectedness often act as a constraint to operationalise sustainable principles. A plethora of arguments over its conceptualisation can be found owing much to the nature of its existence. As a result, clear and encompassing theories related to sustainable tourism are still to emerge. Third, it is ironical that major official organisations including the UNWTO Taskforce have chosen not to define sustainable tourism. For, the Taskforce argues that it is a site-specific or destination-specific concept and, therefore, should be defined on a case-by-case basis (Manning 1999: 20, 179–81). Fourth, current directions in tourism research often favour the pursuit of a commoditised tourism product in the search for increased efficiency and global profits using research paradigms that narrowly pursue this direction (Wearing et al. 2005). Fifth, when sustainable tourism has been applied to the industry, more emphasis has often been given to tourism’s effects upon the environment and economy, rather than to the factors related to its effect on communities (Hardy et al. 2002). In other words, the cardinal principle of sustainability, that is the ‘well-being’ of the humanity (of the present and of the future) and inter-generational equity of resources, did not get adequate consideration.

For critics like Sharpley (2002), sustainable tourism is also not a universally appropriate vehicle for development. He paraphrased Wall (1997) to suggest that it might result in unsustainable development. Hence, what makes sustainability principles and practice a perpetual source of criticism for its critics? Or, as Sharpley (2002) and many others argued, does it enable the misappropriation of the theoretical premises of sustainability little more than a convenient, attractive ‘green’ mantle behind which the tourism industry has been able to hide? Indeed, the basic issues can be conceptualised at two levels. First, the efforts of those who oppose mass tourism to uncritically equate all forms of alternative tourism with sustainable tourism. Many studies have shown this as erroneous because like unplanned mass tourism, alternative forms can be equally harmful due to the same reasons as those of mass tourism, and indeed, some forms like ecotourism could be even more harmful (Hall 1994; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Vivanco 2002). Many sub-groups of alternative tourists use it as a form of competition for exclusivity—a sort of an ego-trip or ‘styles of travel’ to reflect their alternative lifestyles (Munt 1994).
Second, the opposition to alternative/sustainable tourism is overtly ideological and in many cases, has the power, resources and institutional support to destabilize the genuine well-intended movements professing the immediacy of embracing the sustainable practices. Such opposition emanates prominently from the neo-liberal economic positions that aim to place corporate profitability as central to the development policy formulation, giving scant attention to the welfare of people and nature—both present and future. At the same time, it would be paradoxical for alternative tourism per se to be brought uncritically under the ambit of sustainability paradigm, since the former demonstrates more of a consumer culture of a period in which, to paraphrase Beck (1999, in Lew et al. 2004), ‘people are condemned to individualization’. In addition, the very conception of alternative tourism is full of contradictions and many forms of alternative tourism are arguably unsustainable—whether viewed from the failure rates of the tourism and related firms (McKercher 1998), high cost of sustainability-related practices, such as sewage treatment, recycling, and so on (Weaver and Lawton 2002), the potential of irreversible environmental damages they may cause since they are practiced in more (most) vulnerable environments, or the like.

But the fact that remains is, despite all claims and counter-claims on the relevance of the subject, evidently, sustainability has emerged as a strong global movement to the extent that even the opponents have started appropriating it—both as a principle and a practice. Moreover, as Hughes (2004) observed, it might be cynical to interpret all the global movements towards sustainable tourism (including the adoption of Agenda 21 by United Nations World Tourism Organization) as a public relation exercise in which the tourism industry applied a ‘green wash’ merely to keep abreast of ideological change. In fact, one could see that the growing demand for many environmentally-oriented and responsible tourism forms have been firmly rooted in three broad simultaneous processes: as reaction to broader environment development dialogue; the changing composition of tourists who are increasingly drawn from expanding new middle classes within post-industrial service economy; and the transformation of market forces and mechanisms. The universality of tourism as an instrument, not just for income generation but more importantly for the employment generation and poverty alleviation, is hardly refutable. The global movement ‘Sustainable Tourism-Eliminating Poverty’ (ST-EP), a collaborative project of the DWTO and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), is a vivid example of an initiative to creatively develop sustainable tourism as a tool for poverty elimination—a major objective of the Millennium Development Goal.

Beyond the socio-economic goals as noted above, as Godfrey (1996) argues, it has politically attractive principles and aims that can be variously interpreted and appropriated to suit the needs of different situations and in different contexts. Indeed, a major group of beneficiaries of sustainability are its critics themselves, especially the neo-liberal states and the global corporations supported by them, who have successfully appropriated it to transform into ‘sustainable business propositions’ because it makes good ‘business sense’. While corporate philosophies and ideologies are fundamentally underpinned by ‘capital accumulation logic’, where profits come before people (Chomsky 1999), there are gradual changes as demonstrated
in the forms like social responsibility and green technology. But, then, these so-called sustainable policies and programmes of the corporations can be seen as nothing but coveted strategies to the furthering of capital accumulation and expansion. Because, as Wearing et al. (2002; cited in Wearing et al. 2005) have argued, these strategy changes have resulted in greater product support by a more well-informed, discerning market. Concomitant processes being underway are the local/regional appropriation strategies of global corporations manifested in the form of, as many put it, ‘global-local nexus’ (Teo and Li 2003), ‘glocalisation’ (Bauman 1998), ‘global meets the local’ (Thorns 1997), ‘indegenisation’ (Appadurai 1996) or ‘grobalisation’ (Ritzer 2004). These practices will also have strong underpinning in sustainable development because on the one hand, they appear as a movement towards more harmonisation of the global–local contradictions and preservation of the diversity, and on the other hand, they may further enhance the homogenisation process of cultures, more consolidation of capital by global corporations, easing access to local resources and their eventual exploitation, and so on, thereby constraining the cause of sustainability.

**NEW TOURISM, THE NEW SERVICE CLASS AND CONSUMPTION**

Though the fast rate of growth in global tourism at present and projections of similar growth patterns in the coming decades could be attributed to many factors, the most influential among them is going to be the growth and expansion of the middle class. The post-industrial societies, with a predominant service class population and their fast growth being underway, especially in many developing nations, create conditions and generate demand for varied forms of tourism products and experience. Instantaneous reaction to this process is that while the conventional wisdom of a tourist as leisure/pleasure-seeker or a recreationist is still dominant, tourism as a metaphor is undergoing transformation in response to the fast evolving economic and socio-cultural processes. Therefore, the time has come to go beyond ‘tourist stereotypes’ and to treat the process as part of post-industrial cultural project, which in other words means treating the tourist as a cultural construct for enabling deeper understanding of this complex process. This is because, the consumption choices simply cannot be understood without considering the cultural context in which they are made (Solomon 1994). Encouragingly, the body of knowledge that deconstructs tourist stereotypes is growing in response to reflexive research approaches and more engaged research processes where, as Jafari (2001) remarked, major contributions are coming from social sciences. For instance, by applying the theories of Bourdieu (1984), Baudrillard (1988), Harvey (1989) and others in tourism studies, many analysts (Hughes 2004; Lash and Urry 1994; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Rojek 2001; Urry 2000) have endeavoured to highlight the interconnections of the above processes.

Modern consumption is more of a metaphor and plenty of interpretations exist, demonstrating this complex process. While a detailed review of them go beyond the scope of this chapter, it is appropriate to delineate the prominent consumption traits to establish changing paradigms of tourism development. Sharpley (2002), after elaborating on the work of
Holt (1995), suggested four metaphors of consumption: consuming as experience, consuming as play, consuming as integration and consuming as classification. Miller (1998) argues that consumption is taken to be an active process, whereby objects, products, places and things can be made to ‘matter’ through ‘the way’ individuals consume them. In other words, the consumption metaphor is all about ‘why, who, how, and where’ of people and consumption. These portrayals are best demonstrative of the complexities involved with this understanding.

The ‘new tourism’ project being conceived by Poon (1993) was meant to portray those tourists who travel with a motivation to enjoy the natural environment while respecting the integrity of local communities in the process. Its growth has been likened as a part of wider shifts taking place in the socio-economic characteristics of the developed Western societies. Hughes (2004), in a similar vein, argues that the expansion in new tourism forms can be explained by the changing composition of consumers, who are increasingly drawn from the expanding new middle classes, employed within the post-industrial service economy. In other words, the eventual demise of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers due to de-industrialisation in the last quarter of the twentieth century resulted in the emergence of what Urry (1990) termed as the ‘new service class’. The postulation of ‘New Tourism’ from this perspective may be closer to the new service class but attempts to connect both as linear processes would be fraught with contradictions because, though both are interlinked, they are outcomes of divergent processes. In addition, as Hughes (2004) argues, the ‘new tourist’ is a fuzzy one because while his interest in physical and cultural environment is arguably a defining feature, it does not necessarily mean that he is environmentally conscious in intention, practice or both.

For a better understanding of tourism consumption and development, it becomes imperative to evolve perspectives about prominent tourism consumption patterns and consequences. For example, Crouch (2004) argues that ‘to practice and to perform are components of the flow of contemporary culture’. From the ongoing debate, three broad trends have been identified. First, the mass tourism, particularly, the packaged type, is arguably the most dominant, and at the same time, the most harmful and irresponsible form of tourism consumption. It is very often related to most adverse impacts on tourism development. The critics argue that mass tourism (in recent years, many scholars prefer to term it as ‘mainstream’ tourism) is an instrument of ‘dehumanization’, ‘subjugation’ or ‘servility’, especially in the developing societies (Singh 2004). The second strand constitutes a conglomerate of alternative tourism forms, where the tourist consumer is considered as more responsible participant, who is sensitive to his actions as a tourist, presumably more educated about the impacts of his actions and adheres to a variety of codes of conducts being published by varied agencies—international to local institutions/enterprises. The consumption of such a tourist is manifested in a variety of ways by indulging in alternative practices—ecotourism, nature tourism, village tourism, tribal/ethnic tourism and so on. These forms and their performers profess to follow the tenets of sustainability, though it may not be so in all cases as cited earlier. This group, though not very prominent, is gradually emerging and their motives seemingly go beyond the ‘conventional’ and the exotic, authenticity/novelty-seeking ‘alternative forms’. They adorn the role of visitors
because their visits fulfil the nostalgia, fantasy, altruism or identification with the tragic past by ‘being there’ at the sites of atrocities, wars or tragedies. For example, Ashworth (2004: 105) argues, ‘the atrocity heritage contains many intrinsic elements that inspire curiosity for being unique, unusual and out-of-the-ordinary and mundane’. Singh (2004) made a painstaking attempt to document some of such New Tourism practices emerging at the horizons.

Since plenty of literature is available on mass and alternative tourism consumptions, the focus of the subsequent discussion would be on examining the consumption of tourism by the fast-growing service class of the post-industrial society. Peculiar to their consumption is de-materialisation, a by-product of a variety of global processes as has been highlighted by Goeldner et al. (2000). These include environmentalism, diversification within the homogenous world, evolution of a knowledge-based society, demographic shifts, massive advances in technology, shifting value systems and change from a ‘service’ to a ‘knowledge’ economy. From being passive participants, the most contemporary tourists have transformed travel to a life-enriching experience by becoming performers and being highly involved, irrespective of whether the place is an already visited one or a new one. In either case, new meanings are derived out of every encounter with the place—the familiar, strange, altruistic or even the weird pursuits. In other words, tourism at present is demonstrative of ‘de-differentiation’ (Lash 1990), reflecting the emergence of similarly de-differentiated development processes, which Harvey (1989) terms as the conditions of post modernity. Thus, New Tourism or the ‘post-tourist’ of Fieffer (1985) is a creation of the knowledge society, which armed with its knowledge base, uses the consumption process as a personal and a cultural identifier, if not a signer.

Viewed from this perspective, the growth of new tourism forms could be attributed to ‘selective consumption restraint’ (Hughes 2004: 502) of the new service class that uses consumption as part of their struggle for cultural dominance. Paradoxically, as Lash and Urry (1994) observed, while the new service class is bought into the ideology of consumer capitalism, they also believe that they have certain consumer rights as citizen consumers, like the right to clean environment—air, water, scenery, and so on. For many fractions of the burgeoning heterogeneous service class, environmental issues are an important concern, though many critics argue that it is superfluous. These fractions, Urry (1995) argued, thus get engaged in ideological struggles to resist a range of environmentally damaging developments and to press diverse issues associated with it. Typical instances of these in the context of the destinations may be the abandoning of overcrowded and ‘unfashionable’ destinations for those attractions/destinations that seemingly fulfil their aspirations for ‘otherness’, as revealed by Urry (1995) in his study on seaside resorts development in the UK.

Amidst the arguments and counter-arguments regarding tourists and their consumption patterns, Harvey (1989) and Hughes (2004) point out that new markets have to be continuously created to maintain and accelerate the pace of consumption because it would not be in the interest of consumer capitalism to allow consumer satisfaction to endure, as it might risk the profit maximisation objectives. So, expansion of production requires that the consumer
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desire be stretched far beyond the natural limit set by biological needs. This reasoning is perhaps quite logical in the post-industrial economy and society, characterised by fast growing white collar workforce which Urry (2000) termed as ‘new service class’. Their consumption culture has been arguably conditioned in the manner of the Baudrillardian (Poster 1988, in Hughes 2004: 502) proposition that ‘promise of satisfaction precedes the stimulation of needs’.

In this context, the tourism production system and consumption process have to be distinct. Here, what is very unique is that tourists are an integral part of the tourism production process, since the final output of this process is the personal experiences of tourists, which is dependent upon the tourists themselves (Smith 1994). The complexity of production and consumption relations—of the tourism operators, producers and tourists—gets intensified through the postmodern tourism consumption culture manifested in form(s) such as social taste, lifestyle choices, psychographics and socio-economic status. The new form of consumption necessitates commoditisation of the experiences as an intangible element of capital accumulation in the form of ‘cultural or symbolic capital’ (Bourdieu 1984; Harvey 1989). The tourist production system thus came about to represent a complex interplay of Fordist/post-Fordist tourism enterprises and the cultural processes; wherein their relationships arguably change in response to the broader socio-economic restructuring. This typical nature of tourism production and consumption system is a major cause of the controversy in conceptualising tourism as an industry and a discipline of enquiry. This again could be attributed to the dichotomy of objectively viewing tourist places (destinations) as ‘products’ of a collection of ‘industry’ components and attractions against subjectivising the whole destination as a cultural cosmos, organically intertwined with tourist consumers, performer-providers, mediators and ‘living communities’.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS—SUSTAINABILITY A WAY FORWARD**

Indeed, the questions of whether mass tourism or alternative tourism, and which form is (un)sustainable have consumed many volumes and large quantum of energy of scholars over the last few decades, and this is going to continue until another ‘alternative’ emerges. Milne (1998) warns that creating a dichotomy between ‘alternative’ and ‘mass’ tourism will not be advisable because all types of tourism development are interlinked. Given this, the sustainability of mass tourism would be worth addressing for three primary reasons: first, its predominance as an activity involving most of the tourists as against a small proportion of alternative types and proportionately higher degrees of impacts. Second, it will continue to remain as the predominant demonstrative and visible form of tourism in the future because it can be seen that even after two and a half decades of clamouring for adoption of alternative tourism practices, most tourists and tourism forms being practiced remain a part of mass tourism. It can be attributed to reasons such as economies of scale, personal constraints resulting from
income, time and family, safety and security, the growing influence of the mass tourism corporations and their promoters or like. Last, at least, by the very conception, alternative tourism is deemed to be sustainable because all stakeholders are arguably responsible participants under such development.

The arguments against the impracticability of sustainability are to be seen as a part of the neoclassical economic ideology—which is primarily profit-centred and based on economies of scale—that aims to promote the conspicuous consumption with least concern for the well-being of the present and the posterity. Even in the case of mass tourism development, the principles of sustainability are operational but what has been reported as often jeopardising the cause of sustainable development is the complacency on the part of the stakeholders, particularly the industry, as their concerns are primarily profit maximisation, even though they acknowledge that sustainability also means long-term profitability. Sharpley (2002) develops a strong case in defence of mass tourism by stating that despite a variety of adverse effects of mass tourism in many countries and regions—which in any case is inescapable—without mass tourism, it was unlikely that their overall economic and social development would have been achieved. Therefore, he argued for the divorce of tourism as a development agent from the restrictive sustainability paradigm of ‘small vs. large’; to embrace a holistic, global perspective, although tourism is inherently and unavoidably dependent.

However, the persistent criticism of the neoclassical propositions of tourism sustainability is fraught with two major contradictions. First, of equating sustainability directly with ‘smallness’ and ‘localness’, thereby undermining its broader principles and tenets, and then equating it indirectly with new/alternative tourism forms. But the fact remains, as many proponents of sustainability have argued, that despite conceptualising the complexities, it should be seen as primarily a philosophy and an approach to development. It necessitates a judicious balance of ‘scale’, between physical resources and interests of stakeholders that can be optimally applied in any context so as to make tourism development sustainable. Indeed, it would be illogical to argue that development is scale-neutral and it should be so because development does not occur in a uniform and unilinear manner. For, the global development agents do not provide a level playing space for the local enterprises of all scales to let their business operations sustain for longer periods. Instead, the emerging strategies of global corporations appear to have been to hide conspicuously their identities through various management practices and operate like ‘glocal’ firms through local appropriation strategies.

As a method and development philosophy, sustainability cannot be brought under a specific time frame because it transgresses the notional boundaries of time and is evolutionary in its nature. Similarly, it would also be incorrect to equate it with any particular ideological position because it does not exclusively represent any single ideology. What happened was, as Jenkins (2006) observes, the environmental lobby seemingly hijacked the term after the Rio Conference in June 1992, resulting in people identifying sustainability with environmentalism. Perhaps, the real problem possibly lies in the level of commitment of the stakeholders, and their attempts in devising inclusive and representative indicators of sustainability. Many
indicators of sustainability are generic in nature and adaptable to contextualisation, as shown in the UNWTO (1996: 12) guidelines, to suite the specific regional and local contexts. Perhaps, evolving context specific indicators—a combination of situational and general—adhering to the sustainability principles would be a logical answer to most of the criticisms. There may still be stumbling blocks comprising groups having varying interests and practitioners having the will and determination to break those. In fact, multitudes of examples are already available, demonstrating the successful practices of sustainable tourism across the world and some very interesting cases can be found in a recent book, *Cases in Sustainable Tourism: An Experiential Approach to Decision Making*, edited by Herremans (2006).

Second, as Pigram (1990: 4) stated, ‘sustainable tourism is essentially an exercise in sustainable resource management’ to an extent, because it is not only good economics, it is also a philosophy towards resource utilisation with a view to perpetuity. Invariably, most critiques acknowledge the importance of resource management, and for us, it is central to sustainability of tourism because in the final analysis, tourism is about ‘places and placenness’, and therefore, warrants their perpetuity for the interest of tourism itself. Hence, it is argued here that in the contemporary development processes, the development models that profess exclusivity may not be sustainable since they would be inadequate to address the complex interconnectivities of power relations, environmental contradictions, and economic and cultural sensibilities of stakeholders. Perhaps, as Butler (1999) has argued, there can be a gap between tourism development principles and their practices, thereby, acting as barriers to implementation to some extent. That may perhaps be the reason why in recent years, we have witnessed more reflexivity, though often unwillingly, of prevailing tourism development paradigms to their structural deficiencies so as to contain resistances as well as criticisms and/or to minimise the internal contradictions in order to sustain. The tourist consuming class is also gradually becoming more reflexive with the explosion of knowledge and its easy accessibility, and concern for environment. As argued by Hughes (2004), the environmentally reflexive tourists would be an ideological gift under ‘neo-liberal capitalism’, since it would maintain both the virtuousness of consumption and realign it in conformity with the principle of sustainability.

Finally, sustainable development dialogue is not new and as years pass by, it is becoming more popular, institutionalised and multi-dimensional. After an exhaustive review, Hardy et al. (2002: 491) optimistically note, ‘The concept of sustainable tourism is real and grounded in the general populous and thus is more likely to be developed beyond the point where it is considered rhetoric.’ In view of the above propositions, it can be concluded that to achieve sustainable tourism objectives more meaningfully, it is important to shift the focus to the conception and implementation of integrative supply-side development models for tourism, since this approach can foster stronger forward and backward linkages with the components of destination, including the local resident community and the resource base. In the process, while it mediates to minimise the contradictions, it will also derive higher economic values to the destination stakeholders and enhance tourist satisfaction, thereby making the development more harmonious and competitive.
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International Tourism and Developing Economies
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INTRODUCTION

Tourism activities encompassing travel away from usual residence for pleasure, business or educational purposes have been a substantial part of people’s lifestyles for centuries. Thus, tourism is not really a new phenomenon. The packaging of tourism for mass consumption dates back to around the nineteenth century. As disposable income and leisure time increased in developed countries, tourism continued to expand faster than the average world economic growth. Futurist John Naisbitt, in his best-selling book *Global Paradox* (1994), subscribed to the belief that tourism would be one of the three industries that would drive the world economy into the twenty-first century. The continued expansion of tourism has been attributed to the growth of world population, the increasing affluence of many nations, the expansion and diversification of travel motivations and expectations, the great technological achievements in information and communication, the fierce competition between an increasing number of tourist destinations, and the deregulation movements (Wahab and Cooper 2001). In addition, globalisation brought about an increase in the number of destinations on the supply-side and international travellers on the demand-side (Baloglu and Erickson 1998).

Because of its potential to generate foreign exchange earnings, fiscal revenues, jobs and backward linkages to industry, many developing countries opted to consider tourism as an economic development strategy. In addition, as tourism has demonstrated its capability of creating wealth and prosperity in a destination, more and more nations directed their tourism plans and programmes towards marketing, promotions and image enhancement to increase the volume and expenditures of international visitors (Ritchie and Crouch 2000). However, as the industry has grown, it has also become much more diverse and complicated (Godfrey and Clarke 2000).

Statistics released by the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) reveals that international tourism has grown substantially in recent decades; it grew at a remarkable rate of an annual average of 7 per cent in terms of tourism arrivals and 12 per cent in tourist receipts. Although domestic tourism statistics is not as readily available and reliable as that of international tourism, WTO/OMT also estimates that domestic tourists are almost three
times as many as international tourists. Although tourism growth has been substantial in recent years, the growth patterns, economic and societal significance of tourism varied across the globe. The country destinations’ growth patterns were characterised by the alternation of rapid growth periods with years of slow or reduced growth (WTO/OMT 2001a and 2001b). From 1950 to 2000, international tourist arrivals in Europe and the Americas grew at an average annual growth rate of 6.6 and 5.9 per cent, respectively; however, these two regions’ share of the world total had narrowed substantially by 2000 (WTO/OMT 2001a and 2001b). The growth in the new millennium was very encouraging despite a volatile international tourism scenario, where the annual growth in the arrivals and revenue were in the range of 3.5 per cent and 8.2 per cent, respectively, in the period 2000–05. East Asia and the Pacific benefited the most from this shift of tourists’ destination choice.

The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) estimates that tourism contributes about 10 per cent to world GDP and also projects growth at around 4 per cent worldwide. The significance of international tourism for developing countries, on the other hand, is less commonly noticed. According to WTO/OMT, international tourist arrivals in developing countries grow at more than twice the rate (9.5 per cent) of the world average (4.6 per cent). As such, tourism has the potential to play a major role in the redistribution of wealth from rich to poor countries. However, the role of tourism in most developing countries also tends to increase over time, making many developing countries ‘tourism dependent’.

Hopefully, developing economies would be able to identify the most appropriate means and types of tourism development that will improve the way of living of the local people. Specifically, the following questions are addressed in this chapter:

- What share of the tourism market is captured by developing countries?
- Which developing countries are major international destinations?
- In which developing countries is international tourism a major contributor to its economic development?
- What are the emerging trends in developing countries’ international tourism?
- What issues and challenges do developing countries face, given their rapidly expanding tourism industry?
- How can developing countries meet these identified challenges?

To accomplish the objectives of this chapter, secondary data analysis was performed on tourism statistics largely obtained from international organisations such as the WTO/OMT WTTC and published tourism literature.

The chapter is organised as follows: First, the adopted definitions of ‘tourism’ and ‘developing economies’ are presented, followed by a review of the patterns of international tourist movements. Next, the growth of tourism in developing countries is discussed. Subsequently, the economic contribution of international tourism to developing countries is examined. Then, the emerging trends, issues and challenges faced by developing countries, given their rapidly
expanding tourism industry, are identified. Finally, strategies on how developing countries can meet the challenges are explored.

**DEFINITION OF THE TERMS ‘TOURISM’ AND ‘DEVELOPING ECONOMIES’**

What constitutes ‘tourism’ and ‘developing’ is a matter of continuous debate. After almost two centuries of the coinage of the word ‘tourist’ in the English language, the nature and extent of tourism is still often misunderstood and there seems to be no agreement in its definition (Cooper et al. 1998). Different perspectives held by individuals, businesses, organisations, tourist governments, host governments and host communities have made the study of tourism very complex (Hudman and Hawkins 1989). Leiper (1995: 6) identified three contexts, where three meanings of the word ‘tourist’ are used: ‘the popular notion of tourists’, ‘the technical definitions’ and ‘the heuristic concepts/definitions’. ‘Each set of meanings serves a particular purpose and fits particular contexts’ (Leiper 1995: 13).

For the purpose of this chapter, the following WTO/OMT definitions are being observed (UNWTO 1995):

- The visitor is the foundational unit in the WTO/OMT structure and is ‘defined as any person traveling to a place other than that of his or her usual environment for less than 12 months and whose main purpose of the trip is other than the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited’ (p. 17).
- ‘Tourism comprises the activities of persons traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes’ (p. 12).
- ‘Tourists are visitors who stay at least one night in a collective or private accommodation in a place visited’ (p. 13).
- ‘Tourism industry is the set of enterprises, establishments and other organizations one of whose principal activities is to provide goods and/or services to tourists’ (p. 42).

A number of authors assert that tourism is not an industry, claiming instead that it consists of many industries connected through their function of supplying tourist needs. This chapter has adopted the perspective that tourism should be recognised as an industry in its own right because of its commercial importance.

The term ‘developing country’ often refers mainly to countries with low levels of economic development but it is also usually associated with social development in terms of education, health care, life expectancy, and so on. The development of a country is measured with statistical indices such as per capita income (GDP), the rate of illiteracy and access to water. The United Nations puts forth the ‘human development index’ which gives a sense of how developed the countries are. Countries whose economies have standards of living lower
than developed economies (Canada, United States, European Union members, Japan, Israel Australia, and so on) have been considered as ‘developing economies’ in this chapter.

**PATTERNS AND GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISM IN DEVELOPING ECONOMIES**

Total international tourist arrivals have grown from a mere 25 million in 1950 to an estimated 763 million in 2004, corresponding to an average annual growth rate of 6.5 per cent. WTO/OMT’s ‘Tourism 2020 Vision’ forecasts that international arrivals are expected to reach 1.56 billion by the year 2020, which is further broken down into 1.2 billion intra-regional travellers and 0.4 billion long-haul travellers (Figure 13.1).

![Figure 13.1 International Tourist Arrivals, 1950–2020](image)


Apart from the remarkable growth in international tourism arrivals, there was also a diversification of destinations during the past decades. While in 1950, 15 countries, all of them from Europe plus USA and Canada, accounted for about 88 per cent of total international tourist arrivals, in 2004, their share of the market had fallen to around 37 per cent (Table 13.1). On the other hand, many developing countries saw their tourist arrivals increase significantly.
Between 1990 and 2000, the greatest growth in arrivals was seen in developing countries (Table 13.2). International arrivals increased by 94 per cent in developing countries. This compares to a growth rate of about 39 per cent in both European Union (EU) and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. Tourism expenditure in developing countries also increased more rapidly as compared to EU and OECD countries.

The developing countries with the highest growth in international tourist arrivals between 1990 and 2000 are presented in Table 13.3. The highest growth figures were shown in South-East Asia although in many cases these can be explained by the very low starting points in those countries. Cambodia, Lao and Myanmar, in particular, received few tourists in 1990 and although the numbers were still not high in 2000, the rate of growth appears spectacular. This table also highlights strong tourism growth in African countries. In every region, there are specific developing countries with high levels of international tourist arrivals. In Europe, they include Turkey, Cyprus and Malta; in East Asia and the Pacific: China, Hong Kong,
Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia; in South Asia: India; in the Americas: Mexico, Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic; in Africa: Tunisia, Morocco, Zimbabwe, Kenya and the Republic of South Africa and in the Middle East: Egypt.

As for outbound tourism, source markets are still relatively concentrated in the industrialised countries of Europe, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific. However, with the rising levels of disposable income, many emerging economies have shown fast growth in the last decades, in particular, in North-East and South-East Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, the Middle East and Southern Africa (WTO/OMT 2003).

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISM TO DEVELOPING ECONOMIES

The measurement of the scale of tourism activity within an economy and its contribution to GDP is a big challenge to many developing countries since tourism is not traditionally measured in national accounts and most developing countries have not developed an efficient
national statistical system. WTTC data drawn from satellite accounts, substantiated by local data can provide indicative figures that can identify the relative importance of tourism at the national level.

Table 13.4 provides data on the contribution that tourism makes to the GDP in a number of developing countries. It is interesting to note that this table shows a different set of countries if compared to the significant destinations on the basis of visitor arrivals. The vast majority of the countries with high contribution of tourism to their GDP (except for Belize, Tunisia and Jordan) are small island states, particularly the Caribbean, as the region is highly dependent on a very well developed tourism industry.

Table 13.4 Developed Countries Ranked According to Their Tourism Industry’s Contribution to Their GDP between 1990 and 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>-36.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Oceania</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WTTC 2003, as cited in Roe et al., 2004.

Table 13.5 shows the value of the top four export sectors in 2000 and growth rates between 1990 and 2000 for developing countries. The growth rate of the tourism sector as an export earner in developing countries, in general, is only outstripped by the manufacturing sector (WTO/OMT 2002).
Another considerable economic impact of tourism at the national level is employment generation. In 2000, six of the top 20 countries had over 30 per cent of its population working in the travel and tourism sector (see Table 13.6). Maldives and Anguilla had at least 50 per cent of their population working in the travel and tourism sector. WTTC developed the Human Tourism Indicator (HTI) using two indices, the Tourism Impact Index (TII) and the Tourism Impact Index (TII).

### Table 13.5 The Top Four Export Sectors in Developing Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in 2000</th>
<th>Developing countries (value in USD million)</th>
<th>Growth between 1990 and 2000 (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1 900,649</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2 120,262</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3 113,902</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuels</td>
<td>4 73,624</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 13.6 Developing Countries with the Highest Levels of Employment in the Tourism Sector (in Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other Oceania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WTTC 2003, as cited in Roe et al. (2004).
Participation Index (TPI), in order to measure the achievement of human development in terms of tourism activity. The TII measures the direct impact of tourism on the economy and is calculated as the sum of receipts and expenditure from international tourists as a percentage of GDP while the TPI measures people’s involvement or exposure to tourism activities and is estimated as the sum of tourist arrivals and departures as a ratio of the population of the destination country.

In terms of people’s involvement or exposure to tourism activities, Fiji, Hungary and the Czech Republic were the top three countries among the group of developing countries, in 2004 (Table 13.7). With regard to the direct impact of tourism on the economy, the small islands of Palau, Antigua and Barbuda, and St. Lucia ranked as top three among the group of developing countries in 2004.

Table 13.7 Selected Developing Countries Ranked According to TPI and TII, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>TPI</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>TII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>80.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>75.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>74.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>55.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>49.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>45.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>41.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>40.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>38.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>36.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Tourist Intensity Rate or TIR (ratio of annual tourist arrival to population size) of selected developing countries was also estimated to find out the impact of tourism on the destination country (Table 13.8). In 2004, tourists in Northern Mariana Islands were almost six times that of the country’s population while tourists in Antigua and Barbuda were around three times its population.

To obtain an indication of the quality of life in the developing countries, the Human Development Index (HDI from UNDP), which measures the level of a country’s achievement in the context of human development, was calculated. It comprises three indicators: life expectancy, education and income. Table 13.9 shows the top 10 developing countries in terms of their international tourist arrivals and HDI in 2004. Interestingly, the top 10 developing countries for arrivals and HDI were different except for Poland. This indicates that high figures of international tourist arrivals do not automatically result in higher quality of life in the destination country.
Table 13.8  Selected Developing Countries Ranked According to TIR, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>International tourist arrivals</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Tourist intensity rate (TIR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>585.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>244,500</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>354.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>53,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>268.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>8,576,200</td>
<td>4,465,000</td>
<td>192.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>501,000</td>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>186.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>158.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>137,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>134.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1,711,000</td>
<td>1,358,000</td>
<td>125.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>52,600</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>114.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>66,200</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>91.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Estimated by the author.

Table 13.9  Developing Countries Ranked According to International Tourist Arrivals and HDI, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Intl. arrivals</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>HDI (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>42,495,800</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>88.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>20,237,400</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>86.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>18,084,600</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>14,415,000</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>85.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>12,432,600</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>11,602,000</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>84.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>8,576,200</td>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>84.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>8,330,000</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>84.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>6,110,600</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>84.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>5,717,600</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>83.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


GROWTH TRENDS IN PERSPECTIVE

The outlook for international tourism in developing countries appears very promising, as suggested by the past trends, supposed economic benefits and the projected growth of global demand for tourism. However, statistics showing the supposed economic benefits of tourism mask the critical interplay of economic, political, environmental and social elements involved in developing and managing tourism. As developing economies increasingly become part of the tourism circuit and many small island states become attractive destinations for tourists, these destinations are undergoing dramatic changes. The rapidly increasing number of tourist destinations makes tourism highly competitive. With limited exception of a few destinations
that have managed to preserve their original nature and market it as a nostalgic or unique experience, very few destinations remain unchanged for very long (Butler 1997). In order to attract as many tourists as possible to visit their areas, the tourism plans and programmes of developing economies are all directed towards fulfilling the requirements of their target markets. An increased dependence on tourism hinders the development of self-reliant and self-sufficient local communities and makes the communities increasingly dependent on the whims of the global market. While the expansion of international tourism has brought about substantial economic benefits, many developing economies have also experienced considerable negative economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts. The carrying capacity of most developing economies are often exceeded as a result of the rapid growth, uncontrolled development, inadequate regulation and difficulties in monitoring impacts over a period of time (Weaver 1998). In addition, infrastructure in developing economies is often not adequately adapted to absorb the impact of large influxes of tourists, who have different consumption habits from the local people.

The negative impacts of tourism in developing countries have been widely documented and this has led some people to believe that tourism cannot be an effective agent of development. However, tourism is still being identified by a number of communities in developing countries as a potential means of improving their well-being. Maybe instead of listening solely to the voices of the tourists with regard to what they need and expect, tourism planners in developing economies should start listening to the voices of the local people regarding their concerns about tourism and what they hope to achieve through tourism, in order to determine if there are appropriate means of pursuing tourism and appropriate types of tourism which will readily meet their needs and desires (Scheyvens 2002).

**EMERGING TRENDS AND CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES’ TOURISM INDUSTRY**

Across the world, societies change continuously, and it is important for the developing economies to monitor and assess these changes in order to make appropriate adjustments or adaptations. A number of trends are emerging with regard to international tourism and these trends will certainly have considerable consequences in the development and management of tourism in developing countries (see Table 13.10). In parallel to these emerging trends, developing countries are expected to meet a number of challenges in their quest for sustainable local tourism development. ‘These challenges include issues of ownership, economic leakage (from the local economy and through imports), local employment, benefit distribution, social and environmental impacts and dependency’ (Goodwin 1998).
Table 13.10 Emerging Trends in Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Consequences for the tourism sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Tourists: shifting from developed to developing countries (for example, China, India, Mexico).</td>
<td>Changes in types, quality and quantity of facilities and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography: increasing number of experienced travellers in older age categories who have higher disposable income.</td>
<td>Increasing demand for quality, convenience and security, easy transportation and more relaxing entertainment facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography: the household size of tourists from developed countries will decrease resulting in higher disposable incomes and spending power.</td>
<td>Increasing demand for luxury, special products, city breaks/short breaks abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health: health consciousness will increase.</td>
<td>Destinations that are perceived as less healthy will be avoided; increase popularity for active holidays; increasing demand for 'wellness' products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New market segments: increasing number of disabled persons travelling; increasing number of students (of all ages) consider travel as part of their education; increasing domestic travellers.</td>
<td>Changes in facilities and services to cater to special needs of the market; offering new or special activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and education: average level of education is increasing.</td>
<td>Increasing demand for destinations offering arts, culture, history, special products as tourist attractions; need for better and more creative communication of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology: the increasing use of the internet for information and purchasing of tourism products and services.</td>
<td>Decreasing role of travel agents; increasing demand for marketing information systems at destinations and emergence of electronic marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation: the increasing availability of high speed trains and low-cost carriers; road traffic congestion.</td>
<td>Increasing demand for international short breaks; increase in popularity of expensive/budget-class cruises; road congestion will lessen coach trips or transport by private car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security: occurrence of acts of terrorism, regional wars, pollution and other crises influence tourists who need to feel safe and secure.</td>
<td>Increasing cost of guaranteeing safety and security; tourists will avoid destinations perceived as unsafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: environmental consciousness will increase.</td>
<td>More demand for sustainable destinations; overbuilt ones will be rejected as unattractive destinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Richter (2004); Tretheway and Mak (2005); ETC (2005).
Richter (2004) provided an extensive discussion on the political challenges of international tourism in the new millennium. She emphasised that these challenges are not new and although tourism has become world’s largest industry, poverty still prevails worldwide. She identified five challenges common to developing nations that are highly engaged in international tourism. These challenges are:

- the need for redistribution;
- the cultural challenge of tourism;
- the consumption gap;
- terrorism; and
- sustainability.

On the other hand, Benavides (2001) identified two main issues affecting the viability of tourism in developing countries, namely, (i) the impact of the leakage effect that is adversely affecting the developing countries’ capability to take advantage of tourism’s commercial opportunities, and (ii) the anti-competitive practices affecting tourism viability and performance in different segments of the tourism sector as well as in other sectors closely linked to travel and tourism.

The development and management of the tourism industry require a considerable amount of investments in infrastructure (for example, airports, roads, water and sewerage facilities, telecommunications and other public utilities) and superstructures (for example, accommodation facilities, food and beverage services, attractions), that generate not only benefits to tourists but also contribute to improving the living conditions of the local population. This increase in social overhead costs can be a stimulus to regional economic development and economic diversification. However, developing countries might not be able to deal with the challenges and opportunities offered by a highly developed tourism industry due to limited resources and inherent political constraints. Developing countries with less diversified economies are becoming increasingly dependent on tourism for their well-being, and this increases their vulnerability to the seasonal aspects of tourism and to shocks (for example, natural disasters, regional wars and other unexpected events), environmental degradation and social pressures, either from tourism or from alternative sources of economic development (Neto 2003).

**Conclusion**

Throughout the world, the most compelling reason for pursuing tourism as a development strategy is its alleged positive contribution to the local or national economy. Given its substantial contribution to GDP and share in export earnings, tourism is a significant source of growth in many developing countries. Many of the countries in which tourism is important are among the poorest and least developed in the world. These countries have limited options for economic development and tourism provides the most viable alternative. However, economic
growth as a result of tourism development does not necessarily result in poverty reduction. Although there is widespread adherence to the notion that tourism represents an effective means of achieving development, ‘relatively little attention has been paid to the inherent processes, influences, objectives and outcomes of tourism-related development’ (Sharpley and Tefler 2002: 1). Todaro (1981) suggested that the real meaning of development is best understood in terms of core values such as life-sustenance, self-esteem and freedom. Todaro (1981: 70) further suggested that development:

…must represent the entire gamut of change by which an entire social system, tuned to the diverse basic needs and desires of individuals and social groups within that system, moves away from a condition of life widely perceived as unsatisfactory and toward a situation or condition of life regarded as materially and spiritually ‘better’…

Implied within Todaro’s definition is the notion of quality or balanced growth. Scheyvens (2002: 244) also states:

The critical issue for whether the future tourism in developing countries will contribute to or undermine local development rests on the nature of that tourism development. Local participation, involving both control over tourism and a fair share in the benefits of tourism is the key, but this must be backed up by reform of the industry and its powerful players, as well as more responsible behaviour of the tourists themselves.

Local communities in the developing countries should have ‘access to information, skills and resources that they need to make informed decisions about whether to engage in tourism development and if their answer is positive, how to engage in tourism development’ (Scheyvens 2002: 9). Current available tourism data series in developing countries are primarily focussed on international tourism and estimated on a national level. In order to get a more comprehensive assessment on the economic and social contribution of tourism in developing countries, there is a need to establish a data series about the volume and nature of domestic tourism, as well as data series on the local destination level. Developing countries should start establishing their databases that can measure not only the economic contribution of tourism — international and domestic — on the local destination level but also the impact of tourism on the well-being or quality of life of the local people.
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INTRODUCTION

For examining the convergence of tourism with conservation and development, this chapter begins by examining the recent growth in ‘new’ or ‘alternative’ forms of tourism, which are being positioned by some scholars as being morally superior and responsible alternatives to mass tourism. The chapter then focuses on the emerging involvement of conservation and development organisations in tourism and presents two empirical case studies—one examining volunteering on a conservation project in Thailand and the other studying non-governmental organisation (NGO) study tours organised in Cuba.

While international tourism has always been dynamic, adapting to historical and cultural milieu, a review of academic tourism literature and tourism brochures reveals an increasing number of labels for tourism experiences or products that explicitly position themselves as different to mass tourism, such as ‘alternative’ and ‘new’ tourism. While there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes ‘alternative tourism’, Cohen (1987: 13) suggested that it evolved from two distinctly western ideological preoccupations. The first is the rejection of mass consumerism by the counter-cultural movement. In the context of tourism, the people participating in this movement are engaged in a quest for alternative, more authentic experiences avoiding the amenities of the tourism establishment and attempting to travel more independently from existing tourism infrastructure (Cohen 1987: 14). The second ideological preoccupation behind the development of alternative tourism was the neo-Marxist critique arguing that international trade, development efforts and even foreign aid were strengthening the neo-colonial structural dependency of the Third World on the industrialised world, thereby perpetuating their underdevelopment (Cohen 1987). Hinch and Butler (1996: p. 4–5) unequivocally state that the contact afforded between the developed and developing worlds...
has traditionally been characterised by the exploitation of indigenous people for the benefit of non-indigenous groups. The resultant effect is that indigenous people have been involved in a constant struggle for their own cultural survival. Mass tourism has contributed to the appropriation of amenities of developing countries and the exploitation of the people and cultures for the recreation of western tourists. It is this strong criticism that is driving alternative tourism and the increasing number of concerned westerners now seeking social, cultural and educational forms of tourism.

Lash and Urry (1994) also identify certain values or characteristics associated with alternative tourism, such as self-determination; authenticity; environmental preservation; social harmony; fair partnerships among local people, entrepreneurs and external agencies; small scale development; greater use of local techniques, skills, designs and materials; and using tourism generated benefits to pay back to the society. Likewise Brown (1998: 100) also describes the characteristics of alternative tourism as being ‘small scale, geared to individual travelers, organised by independent operators but controlled by the host community, environmentally sustainable and culturally enhancing.’ Linking the concept of alternative tourism to tourism market niches, Prosser (1994) sees alternative tourism as a generic term for those niches seeking sustainability, such as soft, green and eco forms of tourism.

One particular trend associated with alternative travel is the incorporation of an educational component. Indeed, Weiler (1991) argues that travel can be motivated by a desire to learn and that educational travel has grown rapidly. She further states that educational travel provides opportunities for personal growth and development and recommends that it warrants further attention to identify the potential benefits to host communities, participants and the tourism industry.

The term ‘New tourism’ was introduced by Poon (1989) in order to identify and explore the changes taking place in the nature of tourism and the new forms of tourism that are emerging that claim to be more sustainable and individual in nature. These recent changes are driven from outside the industry as well as from within. Poon (1993) states that since the Second World War, the international tourism sector has displayed the same features as its manufacturing counterpart—standardised holidays that were rigidly packaged and mass produced. Mass tourism was shaped by various compelling forces, such as mass consumers, paid holiday time, computer technology and standardised production. Today, however, tourism is being shaped by equally compelling forces, such as flexible production, ecological concerns, an emphasis on expressions of individuality and globalisation. Hence, there has been a visible shift away from the Fordist regime of mass tourism and packaged holidays, and a steady move towards independent holidays and small group tours which are more representative of post-Fordist or ‘new’ forms of tourism. Urry (1990) also believes that the recent trends in tourism indicate a consumer reaction against mass tourism with the emergence of specialised markets indicative of the post-Fordist mode of consumption.
Poon (1993) identifies ‘new consumers’ as being one of the most significant internally driven changes to the nature of tourism, with changes in consumer behaviour, values and motivations providing the fundamental guiding force for New Tourism. New tourists are defined by Poon (1989) as opposite to the tourists of the past who preferred mass organised tours. Accordingly, new tourists are more flexible and individual, independent, far more experienced, educated and concerned with environmental issues. Many new tourists see their vacation as an extension of their life, with holiday style and destination choice often seen as a reflection of one’s identity and a means of affirming their individuality. The changing lifestyles of new consumers is creating demand for more targeted holidays catering to their specific situations, while changing values are also generating demand for more environmentally conscious and Nature oriented holidays. New tourists, according to Poon (1993), consider the environment and the culture of the destinations that they visit as a key part of the holiday experience. Butcher (2003) expands on this notion, labelling these tourists ‘new moral tourists’, because they see themselves as morally superior to other tourists due to the values and characteristics associated with New Tourism. Similarly, Crompton (1993) draws parallels between the rise of the new middle classes and the growth in consumer capitalism and its emphasis on ‘lifestyle’, which includes the places people choose to live, the activities they engage in and also the holiday choices they make.

It could be argued that ‘New Tourism’ and ‘alternative tourism’ are different terms for the same form of tourism. While Poon (1989) may believe that New Tourism is different in that it has a set of very specific characteristics and demonstrates values that involve a sense of moral superiority to other forms of tourism, these are in fact very similar to the values and characteristics Lash and Urry (1994) associate with alternative tourism, as described above. Rather than getting side-tracked with the many definitions, the important point to make is that New Tourism (as we will refer to this form of tourism in the remainder of this chapter) is primarily associated with values designed to reduce negative impacts and enhance sustainability, and it is characterised by authentic experiences with more involvement of local people in decision making. New Tourism is also more individualistic, flexible and segmented in nature, providing opportunities in fields such as archaeology, development, education, anthropology, ecology, conservation and science. It is these values and characteristics that distinguish new forms of tourism from mass tourism.

**The Involvement of Conservation and Development Organisations in Tourism**

**Conservation Holidays**

One of the most recent tourism niches to emerge is volunteer vacations, for which paying volunteer tourists are used as a source of labour and funding on a variety of projects. While volunteer vacation opportunities exist in the fields of education, archaeology and community
development, conservation projects seem to offer the most opportunities. Conservation holidays typically involve volunteers in wildlife rehabilitation, environmental research and education activities. Apart from providing opportunities to take part in hands-on conservation, these experiences also frequently provide volunteers with the chance to be immersed in a different culture, as they are often based in local villages in developing countries.

The increasing involvement of conservation organisations in volunteer tourism has been supply- and demand-driven. For instance, in relation to supply, the emergence of organisations set up to coordinate volunteering opportunities and the dissemination of information via internet websites and guidebooks have led to the development of a substantial volunteer vacation (and indeed conservation holiday) market that has helped finance projects that may otherwise not have been feasible (Ellis 2003; Halpenny and Caissie 2003). In relation to demand-driven growth, many conservation projects report having frequent approaches made by prospective volunteers seeking a ‘hands-on’ volunteer placement, with many such projects subsequently embracing this supply. Indeed, the utilisation of volunteers is seen as a strategy that can raise funds and labour, whilst also building a body of supporters who can spread awareness of a project’s philosophies and objectives (Dutton and Meakins 1991; Turner et al. 2001).

Turning to examine the case study of Thailand, a brief analysis of the environmental and conservation movements suggests that it is based on an alternative paradigm, as usually evident in developed nations.

While environmental problems are ongoing in Thailand, environmentalism has become an integral part of society, challenging suggestions that environmentalism is a movement associated with the developed world and is not a concern for those in developing nations, such as Thailand (Hirsch 1996). Government and non-government initiatives have been underway in Thailand since the mid-twentieth century, with more NGOs recently becoming involved in environmental issues. Furthermore, while the growth of the middle classes has traditionally been associated with the development of the environmental movement, in developing countries, environmental concern is also frequently based on Buddhist values and the struggle to maintain a livelihood (Hirsch 1996).

Indeed, a variety of organisations make up an active environmental movement operating in Thailand, and many of these NGOs provide volunteering opportunities for paying volunteer tourists. The Wild Animal Rescue Foundation of Thailand (known as WAR) is one such organisation. WAR is a non-profit, charitable organisation responsible for several wildlife projects that provide volunteering opportunities in areas, such as the Baan Talae Nork Wild Animal Sanctuary, Lopburi Zoo and Wild Animal Rescue Center, the Sea Turtle Conservation and Wildlife Sanctuary Project and the Gibbon Rehabilitation Project (GRP), which is the focus of case study one.

NGO Study Tours

Another variant niche within New Tourism is where tourists who want a meaningful and educational experience look towards development and human rights organisations that run
study tours to provide this experience. These tours provide participants with opportunities to visit development projects and meet with grassroots organisations and local people to discuss the development issues that particular culture is faced with, and what local and international efforts are doing to alleviate and improve these circumstances. The idea is that these tours will give back money to the communities visited and minimise the negative impacts typically associated with tourism while tour participants will be motivated to disseminate the knowledge they have gained and work towards supporting efforts to help these countries.

A historical and anthropological analysis of development highlights that from its conception it has been subjected to shifting approaches and different forms with highly divergent interests, from economic development to socio-cultural issues determining the development process to differences between expert-based development, endogenous, rights-based, participatory, bottom-up or sustainable forms of development. Other approaches have questioned the development process, claiming that through discourse, development has manufactured categories like ‘the poor’, ‘underdevelopment’, ‘Third World’, ‘the West’, ‘the Rest’, and so on (Escobar 1995; Foucault 1972; Hall 2002; Illich 2001). Most recently, some development specialists suggest that development has not only failed in its undertakings but it is inherently flawed and has actually perpetuated poverty in many instances. Yet another shift in development paradigms now centres on pro-poor growth, including tourism strategies.

Thus, there has been a recent move by development organisations towards greater involvement in tourism initiatives. Such agencies are at the forefront of development in developing countries and extremely aware of the issues that the Third World cultures deal with on a daily basis and they can see that tourism is continually growing. They, therefore, become involved in various capacities in an effort to minimise the negative impacts that are frequently associated with tourism. For example, development agencies may be involved in drafting and promoting responsible tourism policies, guidelines and practices. Alternatively, they may focus on helping the establishment of links among in-country operators, overseas tour operators, government bodies and NGOs, in an effort to implement these policies, guidelines and practices. As identified above, other agencies actually have subsidiary arms that develop tours focusing specifically on the development issues of a particular country.

However, the increasing popularity of conservation holidays and NGO study tours raises many questions concerning the participants who undertake this type of alternative tourism, the experiences afforded to participants and the outcomes of these experiences. For instance, do these tourists demonstrate a genuine interest in conservation/development issues or are they solely in pursuit of cultural capital; in such case they are referred as ego-tourists (Bourdieu 1984; Munt 1994). Hence, are these forms of tourism environmentally and culturally sustainable, educational, and more significantly, do they have the potential to make positive contributions to environmental conservation and sustainable development?

The following two case studies draw on doctoral research, examining the involvement of conservation and development organisations in tourism. While it is not within the scope of
this chapter to comprehensively examine all of the above questions, the following two case studies will provide examples of how these experiences demonstrate the values and characteristics associated with the New Tourism paradigm.

*Case Study One: Volunteering on a Conservation Project in Thailand*

The empirical research conducted at the GRP took the form of an ethnographic case study. Ethnography involves participating in people’s daily lives for an extended period, with the aim of gaining an understanding of the subject under investigation (Malinowski 1922; Miles and Huberman 1994; Taylor and Bogdan 1998). To achieve this, Broad spent six months as a volunteer at the GRP during 1999–2000. The population for the study was 40 volunteers present onsite during their six-month volunteering period, and data was also collected from e-mail questionnaires sent to them post trip.

The GRP was established in the early 1990s with the aim of saving gibbons and their rainforest habitat. Gibbons are small apes exclusive to South-East Asia, and all 11 species are endangered. In Thailand, gibbons are poached from forests to be kept as pets or used as tourist attractions, and while it is illegal, gibbons are still easily found on the streets and in the bars of tourist areas. The GRP cares for gibbons that have been seized, runs educational campaigns to reduce its tourist demand and raises funds for its conservation.

In 1999, the cost of volunteering at the GRP was USD 650 for the first eight weeks, and USD 50 for each additional week. The study population of 40 volunteers had an age range of 18–48 years with 25 being the average age. There were 25 female and 15 male volunteers. In all, 10 nationalities were represented, with the highest proportion of volunteers from England (16) and Holland (11). Three quarters of volunteers were studying for or had completed at least a Bachelor’s degree. The average length of stay at the GRP was around four months with the minimum being three weeks and the maximum being 17 months.

Regarding the day-to-day operation of the project, volunteers worked by building and maintaining cages, feeding and observing the project’s gibbons, and educating visitors about the project and its objectives. While volunteers generally worked around nine hours a day, six days a week, the volunteering experience was more than just the work carried out at the project, as volunteers frequently undertook typical tourist activities around the island, such as shopping, visiting the beach and other tourist attractions. However, other aspects of the volunteers’ non-working life were vastly different from typical tourist experiences. For instance, volunteers lived at the project in a small, predominantly Muslim village. They engaged in common daily village activities (for example, eating at local restaurants, shopping at markets, travelling by public transport, hitch-hiking with locals), interacted frequently with the local Thai community, and attended religious and cultural festivals, and sites with their Thai friends, who could explain the meanings associated with the event or site.

While the study aimed to gain an understanding of the volunteer experience, it also sought to investigate how volunteering fitted into the lives of volunteers. In examining the volunteers’
motivations, it was evident that each volunteer was motivated by more than one of the four mutually exclusive categories of motivation that were identified from the data. Indeed, it was found that just under two-thirds of volunteers were motivated by an altruistic desire to help wildlife or conservation; two-thirds were at least partly motivated by a desire to travel and experience a different culture; a little more than half were motivated by personal interest, such as a desire to learn about primates; and about half hoped to gain experience and skills relevant to their studies and future career plans. A fifth category of motivation, ‘GRP factors’, was also identified and helped to explain the volunteers’ choice of the GRP as opposed to other volunteer vacation opportunities.

A range of the volunteers’ prior experiences were also examined, to gain an understanding of how these experiences may have influenced volunteers’ participation at the GRP. Despite the volunteers being very young, for many, volunteering at the GRP was part of a lifestyle that already focused on conservation or animals/wildlife in some way rather than it being a one-off experience. Of the population of 40 volunteers, more than three quarters had some sort of relevant experience, either through their studies or previous volunteering, and as mentioned above, almost half were motivated by a desire to enhance their future career in a relevant field. Furthermore, of the 19 volunteers who were formally interviewed, all had pets at some stage in their lives and had undertaken other leisure/tourist experiences with animals/wildlife; and a large majority indicated that they supported the principles of conservation, had prior involvement with conservation or animal welfare organisations, either financially and/or actively; and they felt different from others or knew that others thought of them that way because of their beliefs/commitment to conservation or their interest in animals/wildlife.

The volunteers were also asked to discuss in what ways their experience at the GRP had affected them. This question generally led to much initial discussion about the volunteers’ perceptions of the project. In particular, volunteers identified the following as being particularly positive aspects of their experience: socialising and working with like-minded volunteers, high degree of volunteer involvement, working with the gibbons, seeing evidence that the project was achieving its goals, a sense of achievement that they were making a personal contribution, experiencing the natural environment, and experiencing the Thai culture. However, volunteers also acknowledged that there were several negative aspects of the project, such as there being inadequate living conditions and a perceived lack of progress in releasing gibbons, and some concerns regarding the financial condition of the project.

Ultimately, however, despite the negative aspects that were identified, volunteers went on to outline and discuss many positive outcomes of their experiences. For instance, many indicated that they had adequate opportunities to think more about such indicators, and, indeed helped in developing more realistic views about conservation issues. All volunteers said that they would recommend volunteering to others and that volunteering in the future in the field of wildlife conservation was something that they would consider doing. Furthermore, many volunteers claimed that their volunteering experiences at the GRP had strengthened...
their commitment to working in the field of wildlife conservation and would motivate them to undertake further education relevant to a related career. Many volunteers also noted that they did not like to be categorised as a tourist and preferred to describe themselves as a traveller or a local, and as a result, would seek future tourism experiences that would provide similar opportunities to experience a different culture and to see things that tourists do not normally get to see.

Case Study Two: NGO Study Tours in Cuba

This case study is also based on ethnographic research that investigated study tours conducted in Cuba by Global Exchange (GE), a human rights organisation based in San Francisco and Oxfam Community Aid Abroad Australia (OCAA), a development NGO. The nexus between tourism and development was investigated by examining the nature of the tours, as they feed into the broader objectives of the development industry’s move towards community oriented tourism strategies. In addition, the motivations and experiences of people undertaking these study tours were examined in order to gain an in-depth understanding of tourists’ experiences, any subsequent behavioural change, and hence, the implicit consequences this might have for development.

Of the seven tours that comprised this research, three were GE tours: Sustainable Agriculture, Women’s Delegation and Cuba at the Crossroads; and four were OCAA tours, which incorporated topics such as education, health care and sustainable agriculture. The tours commenced in Havana and travelled through numerous provinces. Participants attended a busy schedule of meetings and projects every day, with one day free in the middle of the itinerary. In the evenings, there were opportunities to immerse oneself in the culture, by dining in Cuban paladares, attending rooftop Peñas (dance and music), or just sitting on el Malecón (the seawall) socialising with local Cubans. Many participants commented positively on the mix of learning and leisure on the tours.

Most of the participants were over the age of 50, female and tertiary educated. A large proportion was involved in work/hobbies related to the focus of their tour, for example, many members of the Sustainable Agriculture tour worked in urban gardening projects. Most tour participants had travelled widely prior to their trip to Cuba and just under half had participated in a study tour previously. Furthermore, a majority of respondents were engaged politically, socially and environmentally, with many involved in new social organisations that mobilise around issues such as ecology and human rights. Many participants were also involved in philanthropic or environmental activities and contributed substantially to charities and had travelled widely as a way of learning. These findings, along with the high cost of the tours, suggest that participants on NGO study tours are predominantly of middle class in nature. However, of the few respondents under the age of 30, none had previously taken a NGO study tour, nor were they engaged with political, social or environmental organisations.
Motivations are important element to aid an in-depth understanding of how meaningful the study tour experience is in the participants’ lives. Motivations for joining NGO study tours in Cuba included authenticity, development, lifestyle choice, education and solidarity. The respondents cited that they wanted to experience the lives of other cultures, thus indicating that they associated an NGO with providing authentic experiences of Cuba. They wanted to learn about development in Cuba because they perceived that this improves understanding and appreciation of other cultures. Participants also said they wanted to travel with NGOs because a proportion of the money for the cost of the tour goes to the community projects they visit. It was indicated that partaking on NGO study tours is consistent with other aspects of their ‘alternative’ lifestyles, thus reaffirming their identity. Meeting like-minded people was also a very important element of motivation. Responses indicate that developing friendships, a sense of belonging and social interactions with like-minded people on NGO study tours give the participants a sense of place and meaning. Many participants referred to a learning objective as a motivation for participating on NGO study tours. Specifically, people wanted to learn about Cuban development issues, which is significant because incorporating an educational focus within the tourism experience is not typical, as tourism generally centres on notions of leisure and recreation rather than learning. The final motivation theme was solidarity; many participants expressed a strong sentiment for supporting Cuba in the face of the US imposed economic trade embargo, by travelling to and supporting development efforts in Cuba by establishing networks with local organisations.

The respondents demonstrated a greater sense of understanding of tourism issues, indicating they generally perceived mass tourism as hedonistic and purely for leisure, and NGO study tours as better because they engage with local cultures and incorporate an educational component. The participants indicated that they perceive themselves to be culturally sensitive/responsible. For example, meetings with local Cuban people enabled participants to discuss and understand the nuances of development and tourism in Cuba, such as the benefits of ending the US embargo on Cuba balanced with potential negative impacts that the influx of American tourists could have on Cuban culture. The participants also cited a strong concern for the disparity in wealth that was being created in Cuba by tourism and discussed the tension between the benefits and the drawbacks of tourism as a development tool.

The tour participants were questioned as to whether their study tour experiences were perceived as personally transformative. The findings revealed that subjective, attitudinal or behavioural changes were mostly reported in travellers under the age of 30. Generally, the older participants felt that the study tours had not changed their attitudes and behaviour but had developed them. This is because most of the older respondents were already very interested in themes such as international relations and development aid before the trip and they were very much involved in philanthropic and benevolent activities. Thus, for the majority of participants on the NGO study tours in Cuba, the trip confirmed their previous attitudes. This indicates that the older participants were more inclined to see their study tour experiences
as a reinforcement of their attitudes rather than transformative, whereas the younger participants perceived their experiences as life transforming.

This does not mean, however, that there was no level of learning amongst the older participants. Many participants gained a more nuanced view on development related issues through the study tour, even though they did not identify this as a transformation. In terms of culture contact, most respondents felt that they had far more personal contact with local Cuban people than they would have if they had travelled on their own or with a mainstream tour operator. This was one of the most important aspects of the experience for most of the participants, and along with the educational aspect, this was what made the tour such a positive experience for most participants. This feeds into the resulting desire and willingness by the participants to disseminate information about Cuban realities and suggests that Cuban culture was promoted in positive ways to the participants, under the banner of solidarity. Exchange of knowledge and ideas is what underpins solidarity efforts and is the reason why Cuban people welcome the opportunity to meet people on study tours. It is an opportunity to develop international networks at grassroots level.

**DISCUSSION**

The description of a variety of volunteer holidays available and various foci of NGO study tours supports the claims in the literature that New Tourism provides opportunities that are more specialised and targeted to individual interests (Poon 1993; Urry 1990). Furthermore, it was suggested earlier that ‘new tourists’ seek experiences that are more authentic, educational, cultural and environmentally sustainable than mass tourism (Brown 1998; Cohen 1987; Hinch and Butler 1996; Lash and Urry 1994; Poon 1993; Weiler 1991). The findings presented above demonstrate that GRP volunteers and NGO study tour participants were not only influenced by such motivations, but also that their experiences reflected these characteristics. For instance, the GRP volunteers were able to experience a high level of authenticity in their interactions with the community and could be considered to be in a ‘backstage’ environment (MacCannell 1976), with their hands-on involvement in conservation. Likewise, it was shown that study tour participants were able to meet with people they might not otherwise have the opportunity to meet and visit development projects, also taking them into a ‘backstage’ that other tourists do not typically have access to. The volunteers’ inclusion in Buddhist festivals and their adoption of Buddhist practices (for example, wearing Buddha images) and the study tour participants’ positive exposure to Cuban solidarity also support claims in the literature that tourists can be subjected to the demonstration effect, and that rather than being negatively commodified, the local’s culture and beliefs can be promoted in a positive manner (Brown 1998; Mathieson and Wall 1982; Robinson 1999; Shackley 1999; Swarbrooke 1999).

The educational aspect of these experiences was also demonstrated in the findings, with participants from both groups indicating that they were motivated by a desire to learn, and
that they had subsequently learned more or had developed more sophisticated views about conservation or development related issues. With regard to the environmental aspect of these experiences, it was found that the GRP volunteers were actively involved in wildlife and environmental conservation activities and many indicated a strengthened commitment to future involvement in wildlife conservation.

The question that was raised earlier was whether tourists on conservation holidays or NGO study tours demonstrate a genuine interest in conservation/development issues? The findings demonstrate that both GRP volunteers and NGO study tour participants were genuinely interested in these issues. Indeed, rather than being a unique experience, for the majority of both groups, their experiences fed into their overall lifestyle, and many respondents from both groups indicated that a particularly positive aspect of their experience was the opportunity to meet like-minded people. Nevertheless, members of both groups also expressed the belief that their experiences were superior to more typical tourist experiences. These findings therefore support the claims by Poon (1989) and Crompton (1993) that for new tourists, their tourism experiences are an extension of their lifestyle or a reflection or affirmation of their identity. Yet the findings also fit Butcher’s (2003) notion of new moral tourism, where some new tourists see themselves as morally superior to mainstream tourists, based on the types of tourism they participate in. Therefore, it can also be argued that these tourists are in pursuit of cultural capital, as a way of representation of the self, and thus they could also be seen as ego-tourists (Bourdieu 1984; Munt 1994).

It was also suggested above that providers of both conservation holidays and NGO study tours offer these experiences at least partly in order to generate income and long-term supporters who promote the project’s philosophies and objectives (Dutton and Meakins 1991; Turner et al. 2001) or share the knowledge they have learnt. Again, the findings demonstrate support for this idea. It was found that GRP volunteers contributed both labour and finances to the project and they indicated an intention to recommend volunteering to others and to work in the field of wildlife conservation themselves. Likewise, NGO study tour participants indicated their support for the financial contributions made to the community projects they visited and a willingness to disseminate information about the realities of life in Cuba.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has drawn on two case studies to demonstrate the values and characteristics associated with the New Tourism paradigm. Importantly, these cases also demonstrate how these specific niches can lead to mutually beneficial relationships between conservation, development and tourism. Both conservation holidays and NGO study tours suit tourists who seek to use their leisure time for personal growth and educational purposes, and they arguably afford tourists the unique opportunity to go beyond superficial interactions for a closer contact and
engagement with the environment and/or culture being visited. Furthermore, both conservation holidays and study tours are a responsible form of travel because they tend to avail small scale tourism facilities and services; they aim to educate participants about environmental and/or development issues; and they seek to make positive contributions to the environments or communities visited.
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Stagnation and Way-out

A case study of tourism development in China from the perspective of new institution economics

LINGYUN ZHANG AND XIAOQIU MA

INTRODUCTION

Tourism industry in China has experienced various developing periods. The number of tour operators has increased from three in the early 1980s to 13,361 in 2003. The business scope has expanded from merely inbound tour organising and services to both inbound services, and organising domestic and outbound packages. The developing trends of China’s travel trade have been illustrated in Table 15.1 and Appendices 15.1 and 15.2.

Table 15.1 China’s Travel Trade: 1996–2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of firms (thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total asset (billion Yuan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue (billion Yuan)</td>
<td>265.29</td>
<td>285.43</td>
<td>29.719</td>
<td>38.719</td>
<td>46.995</td>
<td>58.980</td>
<td>71.063</td>
<td>65.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total profit (billion Yuan)</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CNTA (China National Tourism Authority).

From the figures given in Table 15.1, it is obvious that the Chinese tourism industry has developed rapidly in the last two decades. Tourist arrival has increased from 3.5 million in 1980 to 32.97 million in 2003 with average annual growth of 10.12 per cent. In 2003, China was the fifth-ranked destination in terms of arrival, compared to 18th position in 1980. Tourism receipt has increased from USD 617 million in 1980 to USD 17.404 billion in 2003 with 15.44 per cent average annual growth. The world rank has climbed from 34th in 1980 to seventh in 2003. The achievement of international tourism development in China is evident in the
above statistics. However, the development of travel trade is far from optimistic, despite the rapid growth of the industry as a whole. As 2003 was an unusual year when China was hit by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), the data of 2003 is not the focus of analysis. From 1998 to 2002, though the number of players in the travel trade increased at an annual rate of 16.25 per cent, the total assets of the whole industry only increased 48.26 per cent in the whole five-year period. The growth of the industry’s revenue and profit in the five-year period showed even slower speed, 24.35 per cent and 10.03 per cent, respectively.

Some authors summarise the characteristics of China’s travel trade as being small (in scale), loose (in sector structure), lack of competitiveness and poor (in terms of performance). It is generally agreed that the cause for the sad situation of China’s travel trade lies in its industry structure. The lack of vertical sector division system resulted in the high similarity of products and fierce price competition which then ended with the slashing of profit levels of the industry as a whole. As to why the vertical sector division system did not appear as in many other countries, no agreeable answer has been given yet. Some believe the root of the problem rests on the tourist products that cannot be protected by patents. Whenever a new package or new idea appears, many firms follow suit. Such phenomena increase the risk for new products and new market expansions, thereby restraining tour operators from being innovative. Many choose to compete on price rather than differentiation. Some authors also attribute the situation of China’s travel trade to its historical roots, as the whole sector was controlled by the official policies under the planned economic system. The ‘path dependency’ is obvious in the sector. Others think that the low margin of the sector has resulted in the lack of distribution chain in China’s travel trade. There are reasonable explanations to all these problems. However, none of them can really explain the problem clearly. Why would tour operators rather engage in price war that hurts all parties, than cooperate to form win-win partnerships? It is especially hard to understand that in a country where government is still very much involved in tourism industry, the distribution chain is still unable to establish itself, even though the tourism authority has already realised the importance to have such division system. This essay is an attempt to analyse the situation and has sought to explain the problem from the perspective of economics.

The Market Economy and Firm Structure of Tour Operator

Vertical integration and horizontal integration in travel trade has been a hot issue in many developed countries. Take the travel trade in the UK for an example. It is the vertical integration that creates the three largest tour groups in the UK. The integration between tour operator (wholesaler) and travel agent (retailer) is a common practice. The vertical division structure has long existed in the travel trade of the UK (Figure 15.1).

On the contrary, in China, the tourism industry was built up by the government and developed under the direction of administrative orders. Tour operators used to be units serving political or foreign affair purposes by providing services to foreigners. Therefore, there
are tour operators (or departments in large tour companies), specialists in contacting overseas travel agents and those specialised in local handling, which is, arranging local accommodation, transportation and providing foreign language speaking guides. Along with the development of domestic travel and outbound travel, more operators have appeared who serve such markets. However, all tour operators package and sell their own products, though they may serve different market segments. No wholesaler or travel agents really exist in China, as is the case in tourism in developed countries. Therefore, no vertical integration ever happened in China.

According to Administrative Regulation of Tour Operator (RCMTA 1985, 1996, 2001) and Regulation of Compensation of the quality guarantee fund of travel Agency (1995) issued by China National Tourism Administration (CNTA), tour operators in China can be divided into two categories: international operators and domestic operators. According to the latest draft of RCMTA, operators have to have no less than 1.5 million yuan (USD 180,000) registered amount of assets and pay 600,000 yuan (USD 72,000) quality guarantee fee to qualify as international operators, who can receive overseas tour groups. While 300,000 yuan (36,000 USD) registered amount of assets and 100,000 yuan (12,000 USD) guarantee fee are necessary for domestic operators, who can provide services to the Chinese only. Operators who receive over 100,000 tourists per year can set up branches. But, for such operators, in addition to 750,000 yuan (90,000 USD) registered assets for every branch, another additional 300,000 yuan (36,000 USD) as guarantee fee is required to set up a branch. Whereas for domestic operators, corresponding assets and fees obligations are 150,000 yuan (18,000 USD) and 50,000 yuan (6,020 USD) respectively. Ever since 1991, CNTA has been conducting annual inspection of all operators.
China’s travel trade has been developed under such regulatory policy framework and business environment. It is the government rather than the market that controls the structure and development of the sector. Therefore, the market failure in travel trade of China has its root in government and administrative institutions.

**NEW INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMIC THEORY FRAMEWORK**

In new institutional economics theory, a firm can choose to itself produce a part of the product or purchase it from the market. The transaction cost is the decisive factor. Arrow (1969) believes the transaction cost is the running cost of the economic system. Michael Dietrich (1994) divided the transaction cost into three types: cost on searching the information, cost to make the decision and negotiation, and the executive and policy implementation cost. As an important branch of new institutional economics, the founder of transaction cost economics, Coase (1937) was the first economist to study the nature and boundary of firms. His study results can be summarised as the following three points:

- Market and firms are playing a similar role; therefore, they are two institutions that can be substituted by each other.
- There are costs in achieving any feat, either in the market or within the firm.
- It is the market transaction cost that causes the market institution to be replaced. However, there are boundaries for firm expansion since there are costs for management as well. The switching point between the market arrangement and firm arrangement is the point when the management cost is equal to market transaction cost to meet the same purpose.

Another proponent of this theory, Williamson (1985) argued that there are three differences between market and internal arrangement within the firm. They include: market is highly stimulus sensitive and can better limit the bureaucracy so often occurring within the firm; market can sum up the demand to realise the economy of scale and the economy of scope; and market has advantage in controlling the cost while a firm is more flexible. However, it is noteworthy that the market arrangement and firm arrangement are not totally the same, even if the market transaction cost and that within the firm are equal. Market and firm arrangement can both be seen as a type of governance structure aimed at cutting the cost by arranging transactions of a different nature, that is, via market division system. Therefore, the question of why a ‘reasonable’ division system cannot be created in China can be translated into the issue of why the cost of market transaction is higher than internal management cost of the firm in China.

In his proposition, Williamson defined transaction from three dimensions: asset specificity, the uncertainty of transaction and transaction frequency. The asset specificity refers to the ‘sunk cost’. Assuming $\beta(k)$ as firm governing cost, $M(k)$ as market governing cost, and $k$ referring to the asset specificity index, when $k = 0$, we have $\beta(k) > M(k)$, because market is more
effective than firm in controlling the production cost, and assets without specificity requiring low flexibility. As $k$ increases, the flexibility needed by transaction goes up, so does the market governing cost. Let $\Delta G = \beta(k) - M(k)$, we then have the curve $\Delta G$ in Figure 15.2.

**Figure 15.2 Comparing Production Costs and Governing Costs**

![Figure 15.2 Comparing Production Costs and Governing Costs](source: Williamson (1985)).

The $\Delta G$ curve indicates that when asset specificity is low, the internal governing cost in firm is higher than market governing cost. Along with the growth of asset specificity, the advantage of market is lost. At a certain point, the market governing cost and firm internal governing cost reach the same level. After that, market governing cost will be higher than that within the firm. Let us take a further step to consider the economy of scale and the economy of scope. Let $\Delta C$ indicate the difference between the two costs, that is, the difference between production cost within the firm and the firm-spending to buy the same product from the market. In other words, a company can merge its supplier or purchase from the supplier. In the former case, the supplier serves only one company, thereby enabling the merger to achieve the economy of scope. In the latter case, the supplier can provide products to various demanding companies in the market and hence achieve the economy of scale. Due to economy of scale, same product in two cases will need different cost. $\Delta C$ is the minus function of $k$; as the less the specificity of the goods, the greater the benefit gained from the economy of scale, hence the ‘production cost’ within the firm will be comparatively higher. On the other hand, higher the specificity, the smaller the scale is. However, since the scale of internal production can never exceed the demand scale of market, therefore $\Delta C$ will never be smaller than nil. According to this, we have the curve $\Delta C$ in Figure 15.2.
Clearly, to minimise the sum of $\Delta G$ and $\Delta C$ is the aim of all firms. In Figure 15.2, point $k_2$ is the dividing point between the market transaction and firm internal arrangement. When asset specificity relating the transaction is smaller than $k_2$, market governance is a better choice, and vice-versa. If the asset specificity is very close to $k_2$, many non-standardised contractual forms will appear.

With the above theoretical background, we will examine China’s travel trade from the following four aspects to find out the reason as to why the vertical division system can be hardly established in China:

- high guarantee fee;
- non-standardised but similar products;
- high entry barrier; and
- high transaction cost and sunk cost limit the capital flow and integration in the industry.

The guarantee fee is a large part of sunk cost for tour operators. It is the guarantee fee that greatly increases the asset specificity of tour operators. It is the economic reason explaining why travel agents do not exist in China. According to CNTA statistics, China had 13,361 tour operators as of 2003, among which 1,364 were international operators, out of which 560 international operators were authorised to arrange outbound tours; the rest 11,997 were domestic operators. The total guarantee fee from operators is over 3 billion yuan (over 360 million USD). Such regulations tremendously increase the transaction cost of an industry starving for capital and struggling with very low profit margins. Table 15.2 indicates that in 1996, the first year the guarantee fee regulation was implemented, the profit margin dropped from 8.96 per cent a year to 2.73 per cent, showing a 70 per cent decreasing rate. Since then, the profit margin has shown a decreasing trend, lingering between 1–2 per cent. In 2003, with the disastrous effect of SARS, the whole industry went red.

Second, due to the complex and flexible nature of the tour products sold by tour operators, the asymmetry of information available to tour operators and tourists as well as the synchronism of the tourist products’ consumption and production, products of tour operators can hardly be standardised. It is the main cause for many complaints. According to CNTA statistics, from 2000 to 2003, over 60 per cent travel complaints were pertaining to tour operators, much higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of tour operator</th>
<th>Job description</th>
<th>Target market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>Package tour products and sell them via overseas travel agents</td>
<td>Inbound travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>Provide local service (including hotel booking and guiding) to tour groups handled by category A</td>
<td>Inbound travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>Package tour products for domestic tourists and promote them among locals</td>
<td>Domestic travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author.
than the hotels, attractions and other tourism sectors. Most complaints are about tour operators changing contents of packages or providing inferior services.

From the perspective of new institution economics, China’s travel trade is facing the ‘lemons market’ type of dilemma, as described by Akerlof (1970). The package tour market in China, today, is featuring on high moral hazard and reversal selection tendency, such as the problem or ‘zero-profit’ package tour. Some outbound tour operators sell tour packages without any service charge or profit add-ups. Some even charge the price lower than the cost. Such operators are seeking profit from items outside the packages that are paid by guests while in destination, and kickbacks from shopping centres and attractions. Such phenomena have been a common practice in South-East Asian holiday package markets, and it is spreading to European packages. Under such circumstances when tour operators can hardly guarantee their own profit, how could they possibly afford to develop agents by paying commissions. On the other hand, as most tour operators are selling similar products with different prices, they would rather open their own outlets than place their brochures on the shelves of retail shops together with other operators’ products. Interestingly, Beijing Tourism Administration (BTA) tried to develop a travel mart in downtown area of Beijing, but failed because only a few tour operators were willing to sell their packages there.

Third, the administrative regulation of charging high quality guarantee fee increases the entry barrier and blocks many small operators and potential agents from entering the travel trade. In China, there is no living space for operators or agents with staff less than 10, as 300,000 yuan (USD 36,000) registered assets and 100,000 yuan (USD 12,000) quality guarantee fee are required for the smallest domestic tour operator or travel agent, while operators or agents on a smaller scale are common in developed tourism economies, especial in Europe. For agents wishing to sell outbound tour packages for commission, they have to have 1.5 million yuan registered assets and pay 1 million yuan guarantee fee. Such regulation sets up a very high transaction cost, thus increasing the entry barrier. Furthermore, those operators who have already paid the guarantee fee would be reluctant to exit from the market or give up the status of packaging and selling the tour product all by themselves to become simply a supplier or an agent. Under such circumstances, small players cannot enter the market and players in the market will remain all-in-one operators who package their own products and distribute it themselves.

In 1995, the first year when the quality guarantee fee regulation was implemented, over 1,500 small tour operators were forced to close, as they could not afford to pay the guarantee fee. More chose to be contractors for larger operators. The guarantee fee also increased the exit cost of large operators. Many large international operators, especially those authorised to do outbound business, preferred to contract out their department to such small operators to earn rentals. In 2003, when Chinese tourism was hit by SARS, though the whole industry was running in deficit, no operator went bankrupt; instead, additional 1,746 operators entered the market (Table 15.3). It is all because the tourism authority decided to refund part of quality guarantee fee, which lowered the entry barrier. It is the policy that shapes the travel trade in China to be an entry-only-no-exit industry.
Table 15.3 Division Structure of China’s Travel Trade after October 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of tour operator</th>
<th>Job description</th>
<th>Target market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International operator</td>
<td>Package tour products (including hotel booking, transportation and local guiding services by local subcontractors or local branches) and sell them via overseas travel agents. Package overseas destination into holiday packages and sell them in the Chinese market.</td>
<td>Inbound travel, Outbound travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic operator</td>
<td>Package tour products for domestic tourists and promote them among locals</td>
<td>Domestic travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author.

Finally, the exceedingly high transaction costs and sunk costs limit capital flow and it constrains the reasonable division between tour operating and package distribution. Both impede the integration process in travel trade. Based on the development experience of travel trade in tourism in developed countries, integration is one of the predominant expansion measures employed by large tour companies. Such integration includes horizontal integration, that is, increasing the market share and expanding the distribution network through merging firms producing same products to realise the economy of scale; and vertical integration, through merging firms of other sectors or industries to achieve economy of scope. Vertical integration can be further divided into backward integration, merging suppliers such as airlines and hotels in tourism industry; and forward integration, which is to merge travel agents to strengthen its distribution channels.

All types of integration are common practices in developed tourism economies, especially vertical integration as many tour operators buy airlines and travel agents. But for China’s travel trade, there is a long way to go. There have been some attempts towards integration but it could not succeed due to mainly political and institutional reasons. In early 1990s, the top international operator, China International Travel Service (CITS) Head Office set up chartered airlines jointly with Air China. The performance of the chartered airlines is far from expectations. Similarly, the top domestic tour operator, Spring Travel, has spent eight years preparing to set up its own charter airline called Spring Airline, but it’s operation is yet to be started. Such integration is even more complex since China has not opened up it’s air space yet.

In general, most integration attempts of large, state-owned tour operators have ended in failure due to lack of specialisation and limited capital and resources flow. In the recent few years, many foreign tour operators and travel agents are seeking opportunities to enter Chinese tourism market. Large state-owned tour operators are also active in searching overseas partners. The opening up of Chinese tourism industry may turn out to be an opportunity for travel trade restructuring.
EMERGING TRENDS IN CHINA’S TRAVEL TRADE

For a very long period, China’s travel trade has developed under the guidance of the government. Government tourism authority intervenes in the industry and controls the entry, exit and competition of the market through yearly inspection, special right authorisation, quota control and other specialised administrative regulations. In order to audit regulation implementations and more effectively regulate the development of the industry, tourism authorities of various level have set up quality audit departments to supervise business activities of tourist enterprises, keep the market in order, and punish firms violating regulations. In travel trade, government is everywhere and extremely powerful. However, the world is changing rapidly, globalisation and widespread information technologies have already reshaped our lives and the way we do business. China’s travel trade has no choice but to adapt to the change, in order to withstand competition in the global market. China’s travel trade has entered a new era featuring a multi-dimensional and more complex development. The emerging signs of changes are:

More Investors and Ownership Structures are Emerging

In 2002, 36.48 per cent of China’s tour operators were state-owned enterprises. The share dropped to 30.25 per cent in 2003. However, the percentage of holding companies in the industry has increased. According to China’s promise before entering World Trade Organization (WTO), China will gradually open up its tourism market. Now, overseas tour operators and travel agents with annual revenue higher than 50 million USD are allowed to open joint ventures or foreign-owned tour companies in China. The package holiday market was slated to be opened up totally by the end of 2006. Now 10 large foreign tour operators or travel agents from America, Japan, Germany, the UK and Australia (including American Express, BTI—Business Travel International, TUI—Turistik Union International, JAL—Japan Airlines Company, ANA—All Nippon Airlines, JTB—Japan Travel Bureau, Gulliver—Gulliver Travel Agency, and so on), have already set up joint ventures or foreign-owned tour companies in China. In China, the number of tourist offices of various organisations from abroad has exceeded 100.

Expanding Market

China’s travel trade started from doing inbound business. Inbound tourism used to be the focus of tourism authorities as well because this market could bring the country the badly needed foreign exchange earnings. But along with the fast economic growth of China and the ever increasing disposable income of Chinese citizens, domestic tourism developed very fast in the last two decades. The shortened working week (from six days to five days) and extended
public holidays, like Spring Festival, May Day and National Day holidays (7 days for each),
boosted the development of domestic travel. The number of domestic tourists increased from
200 million in 1984 to 930 million in 2004. The total revenue from domestic travel in 2004
exceeded 400 billion yuan (USD 48 billion). Outbound travel also experienced a similar boomi-
ing period. In the mid-1990s, China’s tourism authority was not active in developing the mar-
et and attempted to control the growth rate of the market. In the early years, only nine tour
operators were authorised to do outbound travel business. As China started opening-up more
and more, the restriction in outbound market gradually softened. Now, 560 tour operators have
the authorisation for organising and selling outbound travel packages. Outbound destinations
have also increased from three in South-East Asia to 90 destinations covering Europe, America,
Australia, Africa, and so on. The number of outbound tourists increased from 2.93 million in
1992 to 28.5 million in 2004, growing nine times in 12 years. Today, inbound travel, domestic
travel and outbound travel are equally important markets and the situation is going to last.

Product Pluralism

In the early years of tourism development, China’s tourism market was dominated by sight-
seeing package tours. It is no longer the case now. In fact in 2003, only 37.8 per cent inbound
tourists came to China for sightseeing, 10 per cent less than a year before, due to SARS. Lately,
Meetings, Incentives, Conferences and Exhibitions (MICE) and business travel markets have
grown fast. Cruise holidays, Visit Friends and Relatives (VFRs), religious tours, study tours,
adventure tours, ecotours, health tours, sports tours, camping and many other newly emerged
alternative types of tours have also appeared in the Chinese tourism market. The tour package
method has also become flexible. Other than exclusive packages, self-service travel, family and
individual travel, honeymoon packages and selective tours are also getting popular.

Emerging Business Models

In order to meet various demands and to serve different market segments and manage more
types of products, the operation method and business model of tour operators are also being
updated. Some choose to develop large tour groups by merging with other operators and
developing geographic networks, while others seek to serve some niche market by providing
specialised products. Spring Travel is the vanguard of vertical integration, which is evident
by it’s preparation to set up its own charter airlines. The recent development of information
technology has enabled tour operators to bypass the middleman and accept bookings directly
from consumers via the Internet. New technology has also provided operators with power-
ful customer relation management (CRM) tools. New distribution channels are squeezing
the living space of travel agents and make the life of underdeveloped China’s travel agents
even harder. The emerging of e-travel agents (Internet travel agents) makes the picture even more colourful. C-trip and e-long, two Internet travel agents in China, have brought fresh air into China’s travel trade.

**CONCLUSION**

Chinese economy is experiencing tremendous change, and so is the travel trade. The opening up and pluralism of the industry urge further deregulation in tourism industry. Government should retreat and leave the market to regulate the industry development and abolish outdated regulations to lower the transaction cost. Tourism Authority should consider changing its administrative targets, functions and working methods, shifting its focus from inspection and audit to boosting the industry development. To globalise China’s travel trade, establishing an internationalised economic institution and industry structure is more important than building up firms of international standards.

**APPENDIX 1**

**RANK OF CHINA’S TOURIST ARRIVALS AND TOURISM RECEIPTS IN THE WORLD: 1978–2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tourist arrivals ('000)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Tourism receipts ('000,000)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>716.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1,529.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3,500.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3,767.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3,924.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3,791.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>5,141.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>7,133.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>9,000.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>10,760.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>12,361.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>9,361.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10,484.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>12,464.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>16,512.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,947</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>18,982.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,683</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>21,070.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,323</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>20,030.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,733</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tourist arrivals ('000)</th>
<th>Per capita asset ('000 yuan, RMB)</th>
<th>Per capita profit ('000 yuan, RMB)</th>
<th>Profit margin (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>22,765.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>23,770.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>25,072.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>27,046.6</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>31,228.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33,166.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>36,802.6</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32,970.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001*</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>222.7</td>
<td>155.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The data of 2004 is estimated.

**APPENDIX 2**

**KEY BUSINESS DATA OF CHINA’S TRAVEL TRADE: 1991–2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tourist arrivals ('000)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Tourism receipts ('000,000)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>22,765.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>23,770.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,074</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>25,072.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,602</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>27,046.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14,099</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>31,228.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,224</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33,166.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17,792</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>36,802.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20,385</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32,970.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004*</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The data of 2004 is estimated.

**Source:** CNTA (China National Tourism Authority).

**Note**
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Exploring Linkage between Tourism and Community Development

A case study of the artisans in Rajasthan

DRIPTO MUKHOPADHYAY

INTRODUCTION

Tourism has emerged as a major economic force in the world. During the period 1990–2002 international tourist arrivals in the world grew by 54 per cent and reached to a level of 700 million. It is expected that by 2020 this figure will be doubled with large increase in the world’s poorest regions (UNWTO 2003). Tourism sector generates about 11 per cent of the world’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and creates 5.5 million jobs every year (UNWTO 2002). Being highly labour intensive, this sector provides vital employment for people with a wide range of skills as well as for the unskilled. These numbers themselves are adequate enough to suggest that tourism has immense potential for the economic development of countries and regions.

In a recent statement, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO 2004) asserts, ‘tourism can be harnessed as a significant force for the alleviation of poverty, as well as for the protection of the environment and traditional cultures, attaching economic value to natural and cultural heritage, creating employment and generating foreign exchange earnings.’

Along with the recognition of being one of the most important economic activity the world over, the negative impacts of tourism activities, especially in the developing countries, have given rise to an urgency to formulate new approaches for tourism development. New tourism approaches are closer to environmentalism than other facets of development activities. Environmental conservation has become the major agenda in alternative tourism approaches, which has been reflected through development of protected area tourism all over the Third World (Mowford and Munt 2003). A few agencies, such as the World Bank and the European Union (EU), provide considerable support to tourism-related projects including economic development and employment generation but no agency is, however, truly into developing and implementing strategies linking tourism and poverty elimination (DFID 1999). It has also been
recognised that growth in tourism activities itself is not sufficient for poverty alleviation, unless guided by planning efforts that are suited for local level development targeting the poor (DFID 1999).

In India also, tourism has been growing at a rapid pace and has already been established as one of the most important foreign exchange earners (Ministry of Tourism 2003). However, there has been widespread concern that negative impacts of mass tourism have been destroying the over-exposed tourist spots. It has been affecting the environment, both physical and cultural, adversely. Another important cause of concern is that the local community, in general, is still far from reaping the benefits of tourism activities in a gainful manner. Therefore, it is the need of the hour to devise and implement alternate tourism approaches that minimise the negative impacts of tourism as well as integrate economic development of the area, ensuring equity amongst people. These strategies should also enable tourism activities to contribute positively towards overall economic development of the area through ensuring development of the local communities, along with conservation of the natural and cultural environment (Mukhopadhyay and Pohit 2004).

This chapter is an attempt to explore the linkages between tourism development and community development with a case examination of the artisan community of Rajasthan state in India. Being a state of premier tourist importance in the country for its historical forts, palaces, unique art and culture, Rajasthan serves the purpose of the present study ideally.

**Changing Focus of the Indian Tourism Sector**

In India, its only recently that tourism has been recognised as a potential growth driver. The country’s vast picturesque locations, rich culture and heritage as well as large and inexpensive manpower availability, make it suitable for development as a tourism hub. The number of tourists, both domestic and international, is increasing substantially over the years (Figure 16.1 and Figure 16.2). A steep increase in foreign exchange earning through tourism has been evident in the past few years (Figure 16.3). It has been identified as a sector with immense potential to trigger not only economic growth but also development with equity, which is one of the prime focuses since the beginning of the plan period (Planning Commission 2002).

The tourism perspective in the country has changed substantially over the recent years. To understand the changing focus of the policy formulators in the country in context of the tourism sector, an exposure to tourism policies would be useful. The first ever tourism policy was announced by the government in November 1982. Though it was recognised that tourism brings socio-economic benefits to the community and the state, the major thrust of the policy was on aggressive marketing to foster international tourism with an aim to present India as the ultimate holiday destination to the foreigners.

It took exactly a decade for the Central government to come out with some possible improvements in the national strategy for the development of tourism which culminated in the
Figure 16.1 Domestic Tourists Over Time

Source: Tourist Statistics, Government of India (various issues).

Figure 16.2 Arrival of International Tourists

Source: Tourist Statistics, Government of India (various issues).
The announcement of the National Action Plan for Tourism in May 1992. The National Action Plan pronounced seven objectives of tourism planning as the central concerns of the government:

- Socio-economic development of the areas;
- Increasing employment opportunities;
- Developing domestic tourism for the budget category;
- Preserving national heritage and environment;
- Development of international tourism;
- Diversification of tourism products; and
- Increase in India’s share in world tourism.

The latest tourism policy was announced in 2002 and it envisaged new directions and priorities towards tourism sector development. The key elements of the National Tourism Policy, 2002 are listed below which clearly depict the changing focus of the tourism planning of the country:

- Position tourism as a major engine of economic growth.
- Harness the direct and multiplier effects of tourism for employment generation, economic development and providing inpetus to rural tourism.

Figure 16.3 **Foreign Exchange Earning**

![Graph showing Foreign Exchange Earning over years](Source: Tourist Statistics, Government of India.)
• Focus on both international and domestic tourism.
• Position India as a global brand to take advantage of the burgeoning global travel and trade, and the vast untapped potential of India as a destination.
• Acknowledges the critical role of the private sector with government acting as a proactive facilitator and catalyst.
• Create and develop integrated tourism circuits based on India’s unique heritage in partnership with the states, the private sector and other agencies.
• Ensure that a tourist to India gets physically invigorated, mentally rejuvenated, culturally enriched and spiritually elevated (Ministry of Tourism 2002).

The major shift in focus of the tourism policy can be identified as employment generation and local economic development. Keeping in pace with the central government’s re-focussing strategy of tourism, the state governments also have paved the path for developing tourism on priority basis. For instance, the mission statement of the Rajasthan state government (Government of Rajasthan 2001) reads as:

A pragmatic policy designed to ensure optimum utilisation of rich tourism resources of the state to generate employment specially in rural areas, to develop a ready market for the rich and varied handicrafts, to preserve and to accelerate contribution of tourism industry in socio-economic development of the state by making tourism a truly People’s Industry in Rajasthan.

The policy statements of both the central and the state governments reveal that tourism has been envisaged as an important instrument for socio-economic development of the local community, particularly, in the rural areas of the country. The role of the government has been envisaged as a catalyst, promoter, facilitator and provider of infrastructure, apart from playing the role of the regulator. A well-directed holistic plan can play a crucial role in achieving the two-pronged goal of the government. Along with the development of the local community and generating employment in remote areas, revival of traditional culture (in art and other forms) can be used as an important instrument to attract tourists, and in turn, generating revenue for the state as well as the country.

**The Premise of the Present Study**

India has a long history of rich artisan work all over the country. A census of artisans in India (NCAER 1998) estimated the total value of production of artisan items to the tune of Rs 2632 million during 1995–96. The study also estimated that more than 4.1 million persons were engaged in artisan work during the same period. A substantial amount of artisan products are also exported regularly to various developed countries. Therefore, it is well-understood that the artisan community forms a sizeable portion of the rural employment as well as contributes
significantly to the country’s wealth creation. A recent study also suggested that both domestic and foreign tourists spend a substantial portion of their total expenditure on buying artisan items (Department of Tourism 2001).

This chapter looks into the perspective of artisan community development in the country in the context of sustainable tourism development planning. Recently, arts have been accepted as one of the important tools for local community economic development (Philips 2004; Mayo 2000). In the case of art-based community economic development approach, art can generally be considered as a community’s inherent assets, where the community arts are defined as exclusive skills and capacities of the individuals, associations and institutions within a community. It is evident from some studies (Williams and Martin, 1995; Phillips 1998, 2004; FICCI 2002) that craft works act as one of the major drivers for tourism activities. Similarly, tourists also benefit the artisans immensely by purchasing artisan products. There are studies in India too suggesting that large-scale migration of artisans is taking place from their native places to nearby cities, and even to other states of the country, in search of jobs that are not suited to their skills (Solanki 2002; Prasad and Rathaur 1998). Above observations raise some relevant research questions ‘on criticality’ of a planned development paradigm for the artisans, who inherited those skills through an age-old process.

Do all artisans benefit equally from tourism activities? If not, what are the constraints that restrict the benefits from percolating through to the entire artisan community? What are the possible ways to ensure that the community can experience economic development while pursuing age-old unique skills? Who can act as prime navigators for this progress that is socially desirable and essential from the point of view of economic development?

Rajasthan is one of the most popular states on India’s tourism map particularly in terms of foreign tourist arrival. According to India Tourism Statistics (Department of Tourism 2001) more than 10 per cent of the international tourists visited Rajasthan from 1999 to 2004. In terms of domestic tourist arrival also, Rajsathan is one of the top 10 amongst Indian states (Table 16.1). The state is also well known for its distinct and attractive arts and artefacts, not only within India, but abroad as well. Being one of the important states in terms of tourist attraction as well as domicile of a significantly large number of artisans in the country, the state can provide an ideal base to explore the tourism-artisan linkage in the country.

**DATA AND APPROACH**

This paper is based on a primary survey of artisans in six locations in Rajasthan, namely, Jaipur, Ajmer, Chittorgarh, Udaipur, Jodhpur and Jaisalmer. Selection of these locations was based on the number of tourist arrivals, including both domestic and international, in various tourist destinations of the state. Sample artisans were selected from in and around the major centres mentioned above. A total number of 250 sample artisans producing various items were covered in the survey. The questionnaire was designed to capture the linkage between artisan
Table 16.1 Year-wise Arrival of Domestic and Foreign Tourists in Rajasthan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Domestic tourist traffic</th>
<th>Foreign tourist traffic</th>
<th>Total tourist traffic</th>
<th>Percentage of domestic tourists to total tourists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>89.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>89.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>90.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>90.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>91.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>90.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>91.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>91.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>91.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>92.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>92.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>92.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>95.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>95.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>94.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


community development and tourism, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The focal points of the analysis are to understand as to what extent does tourism affect the development of the artisan community of Rajasthan and to explore options that would be a key for the planning authorities of the state for their development. To serve this purpose the study has used simple analysis of two-way tables to identify relationship between important parameters that include income, education, sales pattern, operational status, and so on. Being one of the most important parameters that reflect the direct impact of tourism on the artisan community, income has been used as the control variable in most of the cases.

In Rajasthan, tourism is a seasonal activity in most of the areas, primarily due to climatic conditions. It is implicit that in the peak tourist season, the quantum of tourist inflow in the state is much higher as compared to the lean season. Keeping this in mind, this paper concentrates on peak season activities to portray the artisan-tourism linkage in the state.

**Artisan–Tourism Linkages in Rajasthan**

Income is one of the major parameters to gauge the impact of tourism on artisan community well-being. Income of artisan households from artisan work in the peak season has been categorised into five groups (Table 16.2). More than 55 per cent of the artisan households in the selected locations had an earning of less than Rs 5,000 per month. At the same time, a significant
The figures themselves suggest that income distribution among artisans was skewed but there is seminal potential of much higher earning by the artisans in the state.

Further, to substantiate this distribution, the share of income from artisan work in the total household income is presented in Table 16.3. A high correlation was observed between these two parameters. Except for the lowest income group, income from artisan works constituted the major share of the total household income for all other income groups. In case of the highest income group, income from artisan activities accounted for almost 100 per cent of the total household income. The important point that derives from the trend is that at a lower level of income, artisans or their family members were compelled to opt for other jobs for their livelihood. Many of them were engaged in agriculture related works as well as in other petty jobs. On the other hand, the households with substantially higher income from artisan works could concentrate on the same as the main source of earning. With this background, it would be pertinent to identify factors behind such a discriminating income trend amongst artisan households.

### Table 16.3 Share of Artisan Income in Total Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group</th>
<th>Share of artisan income to total income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2,500</td>
<td>47.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>68.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>90.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 11,999</td>
<td>91.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12,000</td>
<td>97.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data.

To determine the extent of the impact of tourism on artisan income, average peak-lean ratio of income from artisan work, according to income levels, is presented in Table 16.4. Peak-lean ratio indicates the differentials in the levels of income from the sale of artisan products during peak and lean season of the tourism activities. The survey data revealed that the artisan income was much higher in peak season compared to the lean season, suggesting that
tourism has strong linkages with artisan activities. The survey also showed that when the household income increased, the peak-lean ratio also increased. This observation suggests that the artisans with higher income levels had more exposure to tourism activities, which was reflected in their significantly higher income during the peak tourist season compared to that of the lean season.

It was further observed that the artisan’s mode of operations could be divided into three groups. First, a section of the artisans were engaged only in producing artisan items. They sold their products to the traders, who in turn sold them through various channels. Second, the artisans who were engaged in both producing as well as selling their own products. This group varied largely in terms of their scale of operation: from those artisans who manufactured artisan items and sold them at a bare minimum prices to those who manufactured and sold them through established channels within the country, and in many cases, even exported to other countries at a larger scale. Third, the group of artisans that worked as job workers, were employed in other’s production units and in turn earned remuneration. Therefore, it would be apt to identify the relationship between the operational mode of artisans and their income, apart from identifying the distribution pattern of the artisans, according to operational.

Location-wise operational mode of the artisans is presented in Table 16.5. In most of the sample locations, the proportion of artisans reported as ‘only producers’ is higher compared to ‘producer-cum-traders’. The only exceptions were Chittorgarh, Udaipur and Jodhpur, where the artisans reported as producer-cum-trader were larger than those reported as only producer. This trend also indicates a significant role of the traders in the market. The relationship between the operational mode and the income level of the artisans (Table 16.6), evidently demonstrated that the income level of the producer-cum-traders were substantially higher than those who reported themselves as only-producer. In most of the cases, the producers were based in rural areas and it seemed difficult for them to sell directly to tourists or through other effective channels that were relatively profitable. Traders, mostly from nearby cities, which are also important tourist destinations, generally exploited this situation and bought those items at a cheaper rate, which ultimately were sold in the market at a much higher price.

Education level could be assumed as one of the prime factors in determining the success of the artisan households in earning their livelihood. Therefore, an attempt has been made

### Table 16.4 Average Peak-Lean Ratio of Income According to Income Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group</th>
<th>Average peak–lean ratio of income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2,500</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 12,499</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 12,500</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data.*
to associate the operational mode and the income of the artisan with their education level (Table 16.7 and Table 16.8). A distinctive pattern between the artisan income and education levels could also be identified. The proportion of artisans without exposure to formal education was significantly lower in case of households in the higher income groups. Similarly, the percentage of higher educational levels was greater in case of the higher income group. The tabulation of the operational mode and the education levels also reveals important findings. A large proportion of artisans, working as only manufacturer and job workers, reported no exposure to formal schooling system. On the contrary, this proportion was substantially lower in case of manufacturer-cum-traders. Similarly, artisans with higher education level were also significantly higher among the producer-cum-traders group. These trends clearly suggest that education/literacy levels have clearly played an instrumental role in deciding the income status of the artisans.

To understand the linkages of tourism industry with artisan activities from a qualitative point of view, opinions of various segments of knowledgeable people, who are involved with tourism activities, including government officials, local residents as well as artisans were obtained. More than 95 per cent of the artisans in Rajasthan were of the firm view that tourism has undoubtedly given a boost and helped in re-generating the artisan activities thereby substantially increasing their livelihood during the past five years. Their income and employment opportunities are now higher as compared to the earlier years. Most of the respondents

---

**Table 16.5** Location-wise Operational Mode of Artisan Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Only manufacturer</th>
<th>Manufacturer-cum-trader</th>
<th>Job worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaipur</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajmer</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittorgarh</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udaipur</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodhpur</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaisalmer</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>23.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data.*

**Table 16.6** Distribution of Artisan Households Based on Operational Status and Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group (in Rs)</th>
<th>Less than 2,500</th>
<th>2,500 to 4,999</th>
<th>5,000 to 7,499</th>
<th>7,500 to 12,499</th>
<th>Above 12,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only manufacture</td>
<td>28.69</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer-cum-trader</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>21.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job workers</td>
<td>52.64</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data.*
have also highlighted that due to increase in tourism-induced demand for artisan products, both from domestic as well as foreign tourists, the quality of the products has improved substantially. One of the major factors for producing better quality products was, of course, more exposure of artisan products to the export market. It is important to remember that tourism plays a major role in promoting artisan items in the export market, too. The exposure has also led to increasing competition among the artisans, which has ultimately resulted in better quality products from all segments of the artisans.

The survey has also noticed that the technology used by most of the artisans, particularly those belonging to the lower income group, is either primitive or the products are entirely hand made. They are far away from reaping the benefits of the advancement of technology. The same is true about the raw material too. The prime reasons for these are a lack of awareness as well as non-availability of credit to most of them. Responses of the artisans related to credit availability is presented in Table 16.9. The responses clearly reveal that the lower the income of the artisans, higher is the problem related to credit availability, especially from the formal banking system. The burden of required collateral(s) compels them either not to take the loan or survive with loans from the local informal sources that lead to higher interest cost.

The foregoing analysis reveals some important points that are relevant understanding the linkages between art and craft industry, and tourism. The survey clearly revealed that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group</th>
<th>Without formal education</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary and higher secondary</th>
<th>Graduate and post graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2,500</td>
<td>40.72</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 12,499</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>52.53</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12,500</td>
<td>29.11</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Without formal education</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Higher secondary</th>
<th>Graduate and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only manufacturing</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer-cum-trader</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-workers</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data.
tourism has immense potential for the art industry and the artisan community development. However, only a section of the artisans could reap the benefit of tourism to a much larger level. If the root causes for these differentials can be identified and resolved, the entire artisan community can take advantage of tourism activities for their development. To understand these differentials, some explanations are advanced based on discussions with artisans, concerned government officials and traders involved in this business.

Artisan work is generally an informal activity, carried out at every corner of a region. Some of the artisans were in the job for years and have learnt the skill of the trade from their preceding generations. Some of them did not have adequate background of attaining the required skill. There was also a significant gap between the capability to invest in business and access to the market. The quality and variety of products differed drastically amongst artisans. A large number of artisans with high levels of skills did not have necessary capital and other logistical support to produce and sell their products on a large scale, even after being quality conscious. On the other hand, there were artisans who had skills along with necessary support in terms of capital and logistics, hired large number of job workers and produced items at a much larger scale. They were enabled to produce items of high quality and high value addition. Access to market made it easier for them to earn higher return on their investment as compared to other less-advantaged groups. On the contrary, most of the poor artisans belonged to rural areas near to the tourist centres and did not have any individual or independent marketing channel to sell their products directly to the tourists. Their production was at the subsistence level and they were compelled to sell their products to the traders at a throwaway price for their survival. These products were finally sold at a much higher price to the tourists at various outlets in the market. The tourists also prefer to buy artisan products from established shops rather than individual artisans due to the fact that available product range in craft shops in terms of quality and variety were larger. These factors have made the traders the key players in the business, particularly where the artisan operates at a smaller scale due to limited capital availability and logistical supports.

Artisans, who themselves were either traders having well developed links with reputed craft shops or owned shops of their own, could earn much higher level of income as compared to others. When asked about distribution of their sales through various channels, most of

Table 16.9  Artisans Reporting Problem in Availing Credit Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group</th>
<th>Reported problem in availing credit facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,500</td>
<td>78.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>80.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 12,499</td>
<td>60.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 12,500</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from survey data.
the artisans belonging to the lower income group reported to have sold large chunks of their products through intermediate traders and only a small proportion of the items could be sold directly to the tourists (Table 16.10). These facts have also been further substantiated with Table 16.11 which demonstrates that average employment per artisan household increased significantly with an increase in the income levels, particularly in the highest income groups. Further, the same also shows that the share of household employment decreased drastically with an increase in the income level.

**Table 16.10  Direct Sales to Tourists as Proportion of Total Sales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>1 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 20</th>
<th>21 to 50</th>
<th>above 50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2,500</td>
<td>78.05</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 12,499</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12,500</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed from survey data.*

**Table 16.11  Indicators of Employment Generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income group</th>
<th>Per household average number of total employment</th>
<th>Share of household employment to total employment (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2,500</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>71.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>76.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 7,499</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>72.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500 to 11,999</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>54.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12,000</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>19.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed from survey data.*

**PATH FORWARD**

The preceding analysis has highlighted that the artisan community, particularly those operating on a small scale, was not being able to reap the benefits of tourism to a substantial extent. The major factors acting as impediments for the artisan community development, especially for the small scale operators, in exploiting the potential benefits of the tourism activities in Rajasthan can be identified as the followings:

- Availability of adequate capital for investment in production process.
- Lack of proper marketing channels that could facilitate artisans to get the right price, commensurate with the quality.
• Lack of training infrastructure to upgrade skills or to adopt new technology and use of new raw materials for better quality products.
• Lack of formal education and exposure to outer world that could change mind-set for shifting to new products that are in demand.
• Lack of any support logistics on part of the government or private organisations that can help overcome the above mentioned bottlenecks.

The above scenario is primarily a result of the development process in these areas that were completely arbitrary in nature and without any conscious effort. It has not been guided by any principled economic development planning process that could fabricate local community development through interlinking the locally available skills and resources to revenue generating activities. Tourism has been developed as a spurious activity because of some historical and/or natural endowment of these areas. Only recently, cognizance has been taken that tourism can be gainfully translated into a significant organised industrial activity with minimum effort on part of the stakeholders. Unfortunately, its potential for the overall economic development of the area has not yet gained enough attention from our planning mechanism. This calls for a re-look at our planning process decisions, particularly at the implementation stage. A sustainable tourism development policy can undeniably play a major role in uplifting the socio-economic status of the artisan community in the country.

Presently, a variety of nomenclatures has been coined to describe various forms of tourism practices. These range from adventure tourism to pilgrimage tourism (Mowforth and Munt 2003). Most of them share much more common features than differences between them. However, without going into the debate that whether so many different forms of tourism can actually serve the purpose of tourism planning at a broader level, one can think of tourism development strategies and their implementation that meet the requirement of the sustainable development practices. Ecotourism, rural tourism, pro-poor tourism, and so on can form part of the sustainable tourism depending on the specific endowments of the specific locations. However, the most important part of sustainable tourism is to act upon the restoration and development of the local environment—the physical, cultural, social and economic—to promote sustainability of the place as well as the community in the long-term perspective.

An integrated effort on part of the government along with private partnerships can change the situation within a small time frame. Introduction of micro-credit facilities can play wonders for the development of the artisan community. It is difficult for small entrepreneurs to borrow capital that is needed to start their activity and also to sustain it with necessary operational funding. There is lack of opportunity to borrow capital from formal banking system, especially for poor artisans who cannot produce the required collateral for the purpose. The promotion of micro-credit system for these artisans both as venture capital and operating costs could act as one of the missing links to bring more prosperity in these regions, particularly for the poor artisans. This is even more important as these artisans depend on the seasonality of tourism activities. For instance, if an artisan is not financially ready for the peak tourist season, he will
perhaps suffer the loss of the most of his year’s receipts. Involvement of government and private organisations in enhancing the knowledge base of the artisans through training on the use of new raw materials, new technology, design development, and so on, will enable them to produce items with enhanced quality. Creation of common facilitation centres will also provide them adequate opportunity to produce better quality products at a lesser cost. Creation of marketing channels either through formation of co-operatives or adopting other means would also facilitate development of the artisan community to a large extent. Local NGOs should play an effective role in giving support to these artisans and also to revive the languishing crafts that may act as seminal contribution to the artisan community development. These efforts would serve to strengthen the backbone of the local economy as well as would be instrumental in developing sustainable tourism activities in the region.

The tourists should also be made aware about local heritage, culture and traditional crafts. Promotional campaigns of the artisan products through various websites and other media will also help in reaching tourists and other potential buyers in and outside the country. Promotional activities may also include creation of accommodation and other facilities in the artisan villages, so that interested tourists can obtain an opportunity to have a closer look at the artisan life as well as at their products. Similarly, this will help the artisans to understand the demand profile of the tourists through closer interaction. Awareness campaigns addressed to different stakeholders in support of actions linking tourism activities and local artisan community development, should be put in place. Participatory mechanism should be devised so that the community can take part in the decision making process in tourism promotional activities. Combining of all these measures together would promise the emergence of a new paradigm for tourism development planning that can enable the optimisation of the benefits of tourism to the local community and further enhancing the ‘value of the place’ as a tourist destination.
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SECTION-D
ANALYTICAL TOOLS FOR TOURISM
Estimating the Economic Impacts of Tourism Shocks

A paradigm shift in technique

Larry Dwyer, Peter Forsyth, Ray Spurr and Thiep Van Ho

INTRODUCTION

The importance of tourism to economies is now well recognised. When tourism changes or policy shifts are being considered, there is an interest in determining the impact the changes in tourism expenditure may have on the economy. For this purpose, techniques such as Multiplier analysis and Input–Output (I-O) analysis are still very commonly used. As such, the technique constitutes a ‘paradigm’ for economic impact assessment. A ‘paradigm’ provides a framework for characterising phenomena that a particular discipline takes as its subject matter (Kuhn 1962). Since a paradigm is not simply a model or theory but also includes instructions on how such a theory or model is to be developed and applied in further research, the standard assessment techniques used in any scientific discipline can be regarded as part of ‘normal science’. And so it is with respect to the standard techniques of assessment employed by tourism economists. It can fairly be said, however, that such techniques represent an ‘old’ or ‘obsolete’ paradigm of assessment. As a result, the standard approach to economic evaluation typically undertaken in the tourism context is both incomplete and misleading. A new paradigm of assessment, which is extensively used to estimate economic impacts in various non-tourism contexts, has unfortunately been little used to date, in assessing the economic impacts of tourism. This new paradigm is Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) modelling. CGE techniques have been used in the tourism context, but so far, not extensively. Economic evaluation in tourism is thus not achieving the best practice.

THE ‘OLD PARADIGM’

It is well recognised that changes in tourism numbers and expenditure can have an impact on economic activity. The standard approach to evaluating the economic impacts of tourism is
based on I-O analysis (Crompton, Lee and Shuser 2001; Fletcher 1994; Tyrrell and Johnston 2001). I-O models are based on the following assumptions (Briassoulis 1991; Fletcher 1994):

- all inputs and resources are supplied freely and no resource constraints exist;
- there are constant proportions between inputs and output, between labour and output, and between value added and output; and
- the prices of final goods and services, and inputs are fixed, as are real wage rates.

On these assumptions, a change in tourism spending will lead to additional activity in related industries, and the overall change associated with it will be greater than the initial boost in spending; hence there is a multiplier effect (Archer 1977; Frechtling and Horvath ‘1998). Sometimes the economic effect of a change in tourism will be estimated using a standard multiplier, ideally determined from previous I-O studies (Archer and Fletcher 1996). Alternatively, an I-O model may be specially adapted to analyse the change in question (Wanhill 1988; West and Gamage 2001).

The use of this technique to estimate economic impacts of tourism shocks invariably shines a positive (negative) light on the changes that result from increased (reduced) tourism flows and tourism expenditure. Additions to tourism lead to additional economic activity, comparable to or in excess of the initial spending increase. There is a presumption that the increase in economic activity represents the net change in activity in the overall economy; there is generally nothing said about offsetting negative effects elsewhere in the economy. Just about any increase in tourism, evaluated in this way, will look good; since even poor policies that have some positive impact on tourism will lead to an increase in measured economic activity.

The fundamental problem with—I-O analysis is that it is incomplete, it ignores key aspects of the economy. It focusses on the industry that is being directly affected and on its ‘direct’ relationship with other parts of the economy. It effectively assumes that there is a free, unrestricted flow of resources to these parts of the economy. The effects that come about because of resource limitations, the workings of the labour and other markets, the interactions between the economy and the rest of the world, are all ignored. As a result, the technique does not capture the feedback effects, which typically work in opposite directions to the initial change. As a consequence, Input–Output estimates of impacts on economic activity generally or on specific variables such as employment are usually overestimates, very often by large margins. Indeed, such estimates can even get the direction of the change wrong.

**THE ‘NEW PARADIGM’**

In evaluating economic impacts, there is a need to model the economy, as far as possible, as it really is, recognising other sectors and markets, and capturing feedback effects. CGE models
do this, and thus they represent a much more rigorous approach to estimating impacts. CGE models may be regarded as an alternative paradigm to the standard I-O techniques of assessment.

A CGE model has an I-O model embedded in it, but it also has other markets and the links between the markets, explicitly modelled. These recognise that consumers must choose how to spend their budgets, as they do not have unlimited budgets. Resources, too, are limited and they are normally allocated by markets. These markets may not perform well and market imperfections can lead to unemployment. Governments can spend but if they do they must raise taxes (or debt) and this means that the other actors in the economy, consumers and firms, must spend less; this in turn has economic effects. The economy is linked to the rest of the world via a foreign exchange market—when demand for exports increase, the exchange rate rises, discouraging other exports and encouraging imports (McDougall 1995).

The ‘New Paradigm’ rejects the assumptions upon which I-O modelling is based (Dwyer, Forsyth and Spurr 2004). It recognises that the key mechanisms determining the size of the economic impacts resulting from increased tourism demand must be taken into account in the estimation process. These mechanisms include factor supply constraints, exchange rate appreciation and current government economic policy.

Factor Supply Constraints

In real world economies, resource constraints generally are present and must be taken into account when estimating impacts of the increased visitor expenditure on economic activity. The tourist industry expands output to meet additional demand by employing additional labour, land, capital, and plant and equipment. Some of these may be in limited supply. In input-output modelling, all price effects and financial effects are treated as being neutral, when in fact there may be capacity constraints in the economy resulting in rise in input costs and prices, especially in a fast expanding economy. If the prices of inputs and wages increase due to an increase in demand, the net impact of output and jobs from the increase in demand is much less than the initial injection of spending. When an economy is at or near to full employment, the increased tourism demand imposes cost pressures stemming from the increased prices of inputs. If other industries employ the same resources, then they also face cost pressures resulting from the increased tourism demand. This may particularly affect trade-exposed sectors that face world prices for their products and hence are unable to pass-on cost increases without losing market share. Any loss of market share by domestic producers reduces the net gain to gross domestic product (GDP) and employment from additional tourism. Price rises may even lead to contractions in economic activity in some sectors. Unless there is significant excess capacity in tourism related industries, the primary effect of an economy-wide expansion of inbound tourism is to alter the industrial structure of the economy rather than to generate a large increase in aggregate economic activity (Adams and Parmenter 1992; Dwyer, Forsyth, Madden and Spurr 2000).
Fiscal Policy

The behaviour of the Government budget sector is treated as being neutral in I–O analysis. However, tax revenue will increase in an economic expansion, enabling the government to either increase spending, reduce other taxes, borrow from the public, or some combination of these, with further effects on consumption. In most countries tourism development is inescapably linked to the public sector. For example, expansion of air transport implies increased demand for airport facilities, road and rail transport, utilities and other infrastructure, much of which is provided by government or semi-government authorities and financed wholly or partly through tax revenue. Linkages between private firms and public sector enterprises can have important implications for the patterns of growth. Further, the level and composition of taxes, the relative size of the public sector and the extent to which the government’s macro-economic policy stance is ‘expansionary’ or ‘restrictive’, all have a substantial effect on the economic impacts of tourism shocks (Dwyer et al. 2000).

Exchange Rate Changes

The nature of the exchange rate regime is a crucial determinant of the economic impacts of foreign inbound tourism. An expansion of international tourism will strengthen the real exchange rate leading to a reduction in other exports and/or increase in demand for imports at the expense of the demand for domestic import competing commodities. The most obviously affected sectors will be the traditional export sectors—agriculture, mining, manufacturing—which suffer reduced competitiveness on world markets due to real exchange rate appreciation (Dwyer et al. 2000; Dwyer et al. 2003a). However, if the increased tourism demand leads to an increase in investment this will increase foreign borrowing and possibly, foreign direct investment for a period, and push the real exchange rate even higher. This will further reduce traditional exports and increase imports.

Under a flexible (nominal) exchange rate characterising most of the world’s economies, the net impact on aggregate demand may be quite small or even zero. Since tourism expands at the expense of other tradeable industries, this reduces the multiplier effect on income and employment, although there may be a small positive impact on employment if tourism is more labour intensive than those industries that it replaces.

The Old vs New Assessment Paradigm: A Comparison of Results

Since CGE models recognise and incorporate these key mechanisms, they are the preferred economic impact assessment techniques for policy analysis. The I-O approach locks one into extreme assumptions about input availability (free availability with no constraints) and
feedback effects from other markets (they do not exist). By contrast, it is possible to test a wide range of assumptions within a CGE approach. For example, the labour markets can be modelled differently; at one extreme, unemployed labour can be freely available, and at the other extreme, additional demand for labour leads to no more employment but only higher wages. Assumptions in between these extremes can also be used (Dwyer and Forsyth 1998). CGE models also typically allow for alternative assumptions about government tax and spending policies, exchange rate mechanisms and consumer behaviour (Dwyer et al. 2000).

Over the past two decades there has been rapid development of CGE models (Harrison et al. 2000). These models incorporate an I-O framework, but they also model markets for goods and services, and factor markets, recognise resource limitations, model consumer spending, allow for government spending and taxing, and allow for external constraints. Models can either be quite basic, incorporating a few sectors and the links between them, or very detailed. They may be static (a snapshot in time) or dynamic, allowing for the tracking of changes over time (Van Sinderen and Roelandt 1998; Yao and Liu 2000). CGE models have been used to study the economic contribution of tourism to the USA (Blake et al. forthcoming), the economic impacts of tourism in Spain (Blake 2000) and in Hawaii (Zhou et al. 1997). More recently, Blake et al. (2000) have applied CGE analysis to estimate the effects of Foot and Mouth disease on tourism expenditure and its economic impact in the UK.

The authors have employed a CGE model to analyse a wide range of tourism issues. The model used is an adaptation of the standard Monash Multi-regional Forecasting (MMRF) model, which is one of many CGE models that have been widely used in Australia (Adams and Parmenter 1992; Dixon and Parmenter 1996). Research applications to date have included

inter alia:

- relative impacts on the New South Wales (NSW) and Australian economies of changes in tourism from different sources—inbound, intrastate and interstate; and
- the economic impact of special events.

Tourism Impacts on a State Economy

Table 17.1 displays the effects of the economic impacts of an increase of $636 million in international tourism to Australia including New South Wales (NSW) and rest of Australia (RoA), all of which goes to NSW with no change in travel to RoA.

In these simulations, the state is assumed to gain 100 per cent of the increased tourism expenditure to Australia.

The simulations indicate that the boost to the NSW economy from NSW destination tourism comes at the expense of the other states and territories in Australia. The additional expenditure
of AuD 636 million generates AuD 364 million in real gross state product (GSP) to the state and maintains 6,012 jobs. However, there is an adverse impact on other regions in Australia. Real state GSP decreased by AuD 121 million in the RoA and employment fell by 2,736 jobs, mainly because resources were pulled into NSW from other regions. The study also showed that while many industries in NSW had higher employment as a result of tourism to NSW, some mining and metal products industries were squeezed by the real exchange rate effects of overseas tourism.

Table 17.1 Impacts of Simulations of AuD 636 Million Increase in Tourism on New South Wales and Rest of Australia in the Short Run, 2000–01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of increased tourism expenditure</th>
<th>Increased tourism expenditure AuD million</th>
<th>Impact on real gross state product (GSP) AuD million</th>
<th>Impact on employment Jobs</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Tourism to NSW</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>6012</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism to NSW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-121</td>
<td>-2736</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>3276</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors estimates. The short run simulations assume that industry capital stocks are fixed; that there are no changes in industry investment; a fixed budget deficit; variable income and payroll taxes; fixed income real wages and a fixed nominal exchange rate.

Underpinning these results are the changes in output and employment of industries as a result of changes in the amount and patterns of tourism expenditure. In Table 17.2, a selection of industries experiencing changes (positive or negative) in output and employment are shown. A more detailed analysis with percentage changes appears in Dwyer et al. (2003b).

It is clear that while most industries in the state will experience increased output and employment from the increase in international tourism others will be adversely affected. In the short run, industries in the state that experience a decline in output and employment as a result of increased international tourism include water transport, metal products, other manufacturing, chemicals, agriculture and aluminium/magnesium. These are primarily import competing or export sectors. In the long run, industries in the state that experience a decline in employment from international tourism include water transport, metal products, other manufacturing, aluminium, magnesium and mineral ores. Industries that experience a decline in output and employment in RoA in the short run as a result of increased international tourism include brown coal, water transport and metal products. In the long run, international tourism to NSW will lead to reduced output in water transport, metal products and oil. These are primarily import competing industry sectors.

More detailed analysis of industry effects is needed and this will be the subject of further research. It is clear, however, that use of a standard Input-Output framework for estimating the effects of an expanded demand for tourism would ignore the adverse employment impacts
### Table 17.2 Changes in Industry Output and Employment in New South Wales, 2000–01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short run</th>
<th></th>
<th>Long run</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td></td>
<td>RoA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gain</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbound tourism increase to NSW only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brown coal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral ores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium, Magnesium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black coal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral ores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aluminium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black coal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole-sale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Author’s estimates.

*Note:* TFT: Textiles, Clothing and Footwear.
on other sectors in the economy and thus provide a very incomplete picture of tourism’s links with other sectors. While the assumptions used to generate these results can, and should, be subject to critical examination, the use of CGE models in place of I-O models implies that researchers must avoid simplistic statements concerning tourism’s alleged complementary links with agriculture and manufacturing. Since tourism in Australia is an export sector and the manufacturing an import competing sector, their competitiveness is influenced by changes in the real exchange rate, where increased tourism activities has adverse impacts on industries within each of these sectors.

The results reflect the particular industry structure of the state of NSW and RoA, and depend on particular assumptions about labour and capital markets, exchange rate movements and government fiscal policy (Dwyer et al. 2003a). However, they also have general significance. They highlight the fact that in real world economies with factor constraints, an expanding tourism industry is likely to have adverse impacts on other industry sectors. Thus, tourism development may be a ‘catalyst’ for the growth of some industries in an economy but not for others—a fact that has not been fully understood by tourism researchers wedded to an old assessment paradigm.

Event Impact Assessment

The context in which the old assessment paradigm holds almost total sway is that of event assessment. However, the problems with using I-O models in the events context are very much the same as those encountered in other tourism contexts (Dwyer et al. 2005). Because the negative impacts of the event are ignored, the estimated impact on output is grossly excessive. While CGE models are now being used increasingly in the assessment of tourism’s economic impacts, they have not yet been used extensively to evaluate events.

A study was undertaken to compare the results from using CGE and I-O modelling to estimate the economic impacts of a special event. The expenditure data for the analysis of this event was based on the Qantas Australian Grand Prix 2000. For modelling purposes an event with the characteristics of this event was assumed to take place in NSW. The I-O model was contained within the M2RNSW model (Dwyer et al. 2005). The economic impacts of the event on NSW and Australian economies, and on the economy of the RoA were estimated using both CGE and I-O models. The results are shown in Table 17.3. The comparison revealed substantial differences between the techniques with respect to estimates of the economic impacts.

The key findings may be summarised thus: For NSW, the assumed host state, the I-O model yields much larger multiplier values, and thus correspondingly larger projections of event impacts on output, GSP and employment than the CGE model. The two models also differ in their results regarding the magnitude, and in some cases, the direction of the impacts on Australia as a whole, and RoA, of changes in output, GSP and employment associated with the event. For RoA, the models differ in respect of whether the impacts are positive or negative.
The I–O model also projects greater impacts on real output and GDP in Australia than in NSW, while in contrast, the CGE model projects smaller changes in Australia than in the state. Differences here are due to reduced output, GSP and employment in RoA associated with the event, which are projected outcomes of the CGE but not the I–O model. The negative impacts on other states come about because of:

(a) the switch of expenditure from the RoA into NSW as interstate visitors attend the event; and

(b) the increase in demand for resources, such as labour; bidding resources away from other states, and thereby reducing economic activity in them.

The I–O model projects positive, or at least nil, impacts on all industries that serve tourist needs while the CGE model indicates that certain industries contract their employment due to ‘interactive’ effects. While not shown here due to space considerations, the industries most adversely affected include export oriented and import competing industries as discussed before, for tourism growth in general. These crowding out effects result in reduced economic activity in the host state, or interstate, or both. The comparison reveals substantial differences between the estimated impacts depending on the type of model used. When an event occurs, there will be industries which are positively affected by the event, but there will also be other industries which are negatively affected. Because the event draws resources away from other parts of the economy, it will lead to a reduction in some other industries. CGE models estimate how these other industries are affected. By contrast, an I–O analysis will only pick up the positive and not the negative impacts of the event on other industries. While further comparisons of events may be useful, there is little reason to believe that the types of differences noted for the event would not exist for other events also.

The change of paradigm has substantial policy implications. A heavy reliance on techniques of analysis, which not so much evaluate the economic impacts of special events as cast them in a highly favourable light, has been inconsistent with their rigorous assessment. There is a strong presumption that overall use of the old paradigm of assessment has resulted in excessive funding being devoted to subsidising special events.

Table 17.3 Comparison of Economic Impacts of a Special Event Using Input–Output and CGE Models (Total Shock AuD 51.25 Million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro variables</th>
<th>I–O results</th>
<th></th>
<th>CGE results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>RoA</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in real output (AuD m)</td>
<td>111.96</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>120.07</td>
<td>56.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output multipliers</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in real GDP/GSP (AuD m)</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td>19.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP/GSP multipliers</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in employment (jobs)</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment multipliers</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors own estimates. Estimates refer to short run, with fixed government budget deficit; real wages are partially flexible.
EXTENDING THE NEW PARADIGM

Tourism Satellite Accounts

Tourism Satellite Accounts (TSAs) have been introduced in a number of countries in recent years and they are receiving increasing attention as a tool for providing increased information on the contribution of tourism to national economies. A TSA is a means for measuring the size of the tourism sector in an economy or for measuring the ‘contribution’ of tourism to the economy, in a manner which is consistent with the country’s National System of Statistical Accounts. The World Tourism Organization (WTO) has developed a detailed framework for their introduction (WTO 1999).

The TSA’s essential contribution is that, for the first time, it identifies aggregate official figures, within the national accounts, for a tourism ‘industry’. Without a TSA, tourism data is disbursed across a wide range of other industries from which it cannot readily be separated. Because the TSA is developed in a manner which is consistent with the national accounting system as a whole, it makes it possible to compare tourism with other sectors of the economy and to examine its components (Spurr 2005). CGE models go much further than TSAs—with them it is possible to tell what impact a change has, such as a change of 10 per cent increase in inbound tourism will have on variables in the economy, including GDP, employment and exports. They can also be used to project the impact of changes in the overall economy on the tourism sector and its component parts and to estimate the economic effects of changes in government policies. TSAs cannot be used for these purposes.

Where a TSA is already in place, it will provide the statistical basis for much of the tourism-specific data required in the development of any CGE model which contains an explicit tourism sector. The absence of TSAs until recently in most countries helps to explain why few existing CGE models identify a tourism ‘industry’ or incorporate any detailed breakdown of tourism data. Even where CGE models have sought to identify tourism, the absence until recently of consistent definitions and data inputs from the national accounts meant that their results have not been readily replicable or comparable from one model to another.

CGE modellers will usually require much more detailed information than TSAs currently provide, for example, about the direction and breakdown of tourism expenditures and where they occur, and about the breakdown of capital investment in infrastructure which serves multiple users, of which tourism may be only one. But as long as a CGE model has an explicit tourism sector, it will embody a TSA within it. It will thus be possible to generate a simulated TSA, where an official TSA does not exist, as an output of the CGE model. The degree of accuracy and detail in the CGE derived TSA will depend on the source of the information it is developed from and on the degree of detail incorporated in the model. This issue is of interest at the state or local level where TSAs are rarely available. A CGE model, which is constructed with an explicit tourism sector in a manner consistent with the national TSA and which draws
on national TSA definitions and data, can provide an appropriate and cost effective tool for producing simulated TSAs at the state/provincial level. This is already happening in Australia (Dwyer et al. 2006).

Dynamics and Endogenous Growth

Most analysis of the economic impacts of tourism is done using a static framework; in other words, using an approach that models the economy at a point of time and examines shifts from one point of time to another. When the issue addressed involves what difference a change in tourism makes to variables in the economy, this type of analysis is sufficient. However, when there is an interest in the adjustment process—for example, how long it takes for a shift in tourism flows to influence other variables in the economy—then a dynamic framework is required. Dynamics can be readily incorporated in CGE models, so that the development path of the economy and changes from that path can be investigated. Several CGE models are dynamic—for example, the most comprehensive model of the Australian economy, the MONASH model, is a dynamic one (Adams and Parmenter 1992; Dixon and Parmenter 1996).

A recent development in economics has been that of ‘endogenous growth’ models (Van Sinderen and Roelandt 1998). These models rely on the existence of various external economies, by which one firm or industry can enhance the performance of other sectors in the economy. For example, lower transport costs may enable other industries to take advantage of economies of scale or gains from greater specialisation. It would be possible to build CGE models that take account of these effects.

Measuring Benefits or Welfare Gains

Typically, the impact on economic activity is much greater than the net welfare gain to the community (Dwyer and Forsyth 1993). This is because additional activity requires additional resources and these are not free. For most policy decisions, governments wish to know how much better off residents are as a result of some decision. For example, suppose a government is considering supporting a special event and it will require A$1m of taxpayers’ money to subsidise it, but if it goes ahead the addition to GDP will be A$6m. Is this a worthwhile expenditure? The answer is that it is worthwhile if the net benefits are positive. If an event requiring a subsidy of A$1m produces an addition to GDP of A$6m and a net benefit of A$2m, then it is worthwhile; however if the net benefit gain was only A$0.8m (that is, less than A$1 million funded from taxation), then it would be a poor investment, regardless of the impact on GDP.

If additional tourism is to produce net benefits for the destination, there will have to be some divergence between the prices paid and the costs of provision, either directly in the tourism industry or in other industries indirectly affected by it. There are several ways in
which this could come about—prices may not equal costs, there may be externalities, there may be unemployment and there may be terms-of-trade effects (Dwyer and Forsyth 1997). To measure the net benefits of a tourism change, we need to identify in what ways the revenues gained from additional tourism are not equal to the opportunity costs of the inputs used in supplying it. With tourism services, which are supplied in quite competitive markets, the prices charged for the outputs and thus the value of the additional output will tend to be close to the cost of supply, which in turn reflects the cost of the inputs used. To the extent that this is so, the net benefit from additional output will tend to be small, especially relative to the gross change in the value of output.

Once the importance of costs of supply is recognised, it is in principle straightforward to adjust outputs of a CGE model to take them into account (Dwyer et al. 2006). Indeed, some CGE models are explicitly designed to measure changes in welfare (Dixon and Parmenter 1996). The approach adopted by the authors of this chapter to calculate net benefit estimation is that of adjusting the estimates of impacts on activity using the CGE model. This has involved subtracting the cost of additional inputs used to produce the increase in activity for the region under study. Thus, the cost of additional labour used (wage by quantity), the cost of additional capital services and cost of additional natural resources is subtracted from the change in the value of the increased economic activity, as measured by the change in GNP or national income (Dwyer et al. 2004). Although this method does not account for various ‘intangible’ impacts of tourism change, the outputs of this approach do imply a move in the direction of applying cost benefit analysis to tourism policies; this yields a rigorous means of evaluating tourism policies that involve costs as well as benefits.

**Summary**

Input-Output models represent an ‘old paradigm’ of assessment of the economic impacts of changes in tourism activity. They estimate the increase in economic activity by calculating the increase in output directly and adding the extra output in related industries, such as supplier industries. They assume that resources, such as labour, land and capital, flow freely to tourism and related industries. These resources are effectively assumed to be not used elsewhere; they do not come from other industries and do not result in reductions in output elsewhere. In this way, I-O and multiplier techniques count the positive influences on economic activity but ignore the negative influences. These negative influences can be just as large as the positive influences and in certain cases, even larger.

CGE models represent world’s best practice in assessing economy-wide economic impacts. They model the ‘whole’ economy, treating it as an integrated network of markets, each of which impacts other. CGE models are the preferred paradigm of economic impact assessment. They recognise factor constraints, the role of exchange rate changes and the fiscal policy
setting as relevant to the impacts that changes in tourism activity have on the economy. CGE models can provide a more informed analysis of tourism’s economic impacts. They are also capable of being extended in interesting directions to guide policy making. While more research needs to be undertaken in developing CGE models to be used in policy assessment, it is very likely that CGE models will soon assume an important role in the ‘normal science’ of economic assessment of tourism impacts as tourism economists continue to explore the range of their applications.
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INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of Internet technology in general, particularly with regard to e-business, has largely changed the way hotel rooms are sold and promoted. Without any limitations of time and geographical constraints, customers can search and reserve their preferred hotel rooms anywhere in the world. Similarly, suppliers can remote control their servers to offer the most updated information about room rates and other related information to online users globally (Cai et al. 2004; Gilbert et al. 1999). Different sources have indicated that the online hotel and tourism industries throughout the world are showing continuous growth. For instance, McGann (2004) argued that the US online travel sales in 2004 would amount to USD 54 billion, representing a 20 per cent increase over the previous year. In addition, the amount of online travel sales as a percentage of total domestic travel sales will increase from 20 per cent in 2003 to 33 per cent in 2009. Similarly, Greenspan (2004) claimed that 67 per cent of Internet users in the US who travel would use the Internet to obtain travel-related information and 66 per cent of these online travellers would make an actual online purchase. As a major sector of the travel and tourism industry, reservations of hotel rooms have directly benefited from this promising distribution channel. Statistical data show that 71 per cent of online travellers purchased accommodation in 2003, representing the second most popular travel product after the corresponding figure of 75 per cent for air tickets (Hotel Asia Pacific 2004a). Cabo (2004) has stated that global online hotel bookings in the second quarter of 2004 experienced an increase of over 10 per cent and that revenue was up by more than 17 per cent. In addition, PhoCusWright (2004) foresees that one-third of all hotel sales will be made online by 2006 and Greenspan (2003) predicts that online reservations of hotel rooms will increase from USD 5 billion in 2001 to USD 14.8 billion in 2007.

As the largest developing country in the world, China has been experiencing rapid growth in its tourism industry since the 1970s (Ma et al. 2003). To receive an increasing number of international and domestic tourists, the hotel industry in China has largely expanded in number of properties and has improved in the quality of its services. The promising tourism
industry and the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games have further attracted foreign investors to China’s hotel sector. The opening up of the hotel industry in China after the country’s accession to World Trade Organization (WTO) makes it necessary for mainland hotels to adopt modern management knowledge and the latest technology to remain competitive. One approach to achieving this is, naturally, the promotion and sale of hotel rooms on the Internet. Zhong (2002) has stated that the online room reservation business in Mainland China has grown from virtually zero in 1999 to USD 383.3 million in 2002 and that the largest local online travel agent booked about 180,000 rooms in a month in the same year.

While the business of online hotel reservations in China has shown potential, sales of hotel rooms have largely been dominated by third-party agents instead of having been made through the hotels’ own websites (Zhong 2002). In China, most hotels at the level of three star or above have established their own websites, but the amount of online sales from these websites has been very low. Ma et al. (2003) have even claimed that many hotels in Beijing, the capital city of China, do not have any Internet sales or reservations. Apparently, hotels in China have established an online presence but they have little or no control of the sales of their rooms over the Internet.

In spite of the growing importance of the tourism industry in China and the online sales of hotel rooms in the country, prior studies have rarely attempted to analyse the performance of hotel websites in China. In other words, hotel practitioners, policy makers and consumers in China have no knowledge of how to improve their websites to attract potential consumers to purchase after browsing for relevant information. The insufficient knowledge of hotel practitioners of their websites has inevitably resulted in more than half of the users having problems with the contents of the website (Hotel Asia Pacific 2004b). The aim of this study, therefore, is to fill this gap by investigating the functionality performance of hotel websites in China. According to Chung and Law (2003), functionality refers to the contents of a website in the context of the hotel industry. More specifically, the primary objective of this research is to develop a scientific method, and then, to apply this method to evaluate selected China-based hotel websites. The findings of the study are expected to help hoteliers in other developing countries better understand the performance of their own websites. This, in turn, will enable them to plan the right website strategy in terms of marketing, communications and sales mix.

Having introduced background information on the growth of Internet applications in the hotel industry and discussed the research objectives, the remaining sections of this paper are as follows. First is a review of the literature on evaluating websites. The methodology section is presented next. It covers the selection of websites, the dimensions and attributes of websites and processes of modelling and evaluation. The section after that discusses the empirical findings and the last section concludes the paper by offering a summary, discussing the implications for industry and future research possibilities.
Without a comprehensive understanding of the contents and attractiveness of a business website, investors could spend plenty of resources on developing a website that will not attract their target customers and, therefore, not lead to a good return on their investment. Assessing the features of websites has been a matter of interest to industrial practitioners and academic researchers for many years. In other words, practitioners and researchers would like to know how appealing specific websites are and whether these websites offer the solutions that their customers are looking for. More importantly, practitioners would like to know whether their websites meet industrial standards from the perspective of technology and design.

While some measurements related to network traffic, such as the number of hits and level of traffic can be used to show the performance of a commercial website, these traffic accounting methods are subject to many limitations. For instance, the numbers that are counted do not constitute an analysis of what motivates customers to make purchases on the website or to abandon it. That is, these data are not sufficient to reflect the behaviour of consumers (Huizingh 2000; Palmer 2002). As the commercial applications of the Internet have shifted from a focus on the Internet as a computer network to its potential as a sales and distribution channel, new methods of evaluating the performance of websites are, therefore, needed.

Huizingh (2000) identified contents and design as the major components of a website, with each of these components having some subcomponents. Palmer (2002) argued that the success of a website is related to access speed, navigation, content, interactivity and responsiveness. The degree of success, according to Palmer (2002), can be measured by a set of well-defined elements and metrics. Gonzalez and Palacios (2004) introduced a web assessment index that focussed on the four categories of accessibility, speed, navigability and content, and then applied the index to different industries in Spain. De Marsico and Levialdi (2004) proposed a model for classifying the websites of travel agents. In this model, Travelocity was ranked second among the websites that were studied. Similarly, Yeung and Lu (2004) proposed a metric to measure the functional classification of websites and applied the metric to longitudinally evaluate the websites of 98 Hong Kong business organisations. The experimental results indicated that the functions of websites underwent only marginal enhancement during the study period. Instead of quantifying performance using total numeric scores, Shchiglik and Barnes (2004) developed an instrument on perceived airline website quality that evaluates the quality of websites based on consumer perceptions.

In the hospitality and tourism literature, Doolin et al. (2002) presented the extended model of Internet Commerce Adoption and applied the model to the websites of regional tourism organisations in New Zealand. The experimental results indicated that the analysed websites were largely at the promotion and provision stages. Jeong (2002) developed a hotel evaluation matrix and then applied the matrix to 35 lodging websites. Research outcomes showed that
the majority of the websites were lacking in terms of motivating potential customers to purchase. Moreover, Chung and Law (2003) presented an information quality evaluation model to measure the performance of hotel websites. Empirical evidence showed significant differences in the performance scores of the websites of luxury, mid-priced and economy hotels. A major limitation of Chung and Law’s (2003) approach was the exclusion of hotel customers in the development of the model. Law and Cheung (2005) partially rectified such a limitation by interviewing 284 international travellers who had previously used hotel websites, on their perception of the importance of the dimensions and attributes of hotel websites in terms of functionality. The data that were collected on the opinions of potential customers, however, have not been applied to the measurement of any hotel websites. This research utilises the opinions collected from international visitors in Law and Cheung’s (2005) study and applies the data to evaluate the performance of the websites of hotels in China. This study can, therefore, be considered an extension of the functionality performance of hotel websites in the hospitality context. The following section presents the methodology used in this research to compute the performance scores of China-based hotel websites.

**Methodology**

The Hotel Selection Process

Ideally, it would be desirable to include the websites of hotels from all regions in China but such an attempt is not practical given our limited resources. In this study, hotels in Hong Kong, Shanghai and Beijing were selected for examination. These are the three key cities in China. Hong Kong is a major international financial centre with many world-class hotels, and Shanghai and Beijing represent the largest city and the capital city in Mainland China, respectively. Furthermore, these three cities are among the top travel destinations in the Asia-Pacific region (Shellum 2004a; TravelCLICK 2004).

The 60 selected hotel websites were equally split between Hong Kong and the two cities in Mainland China. The websites of 30 hotels in Shanghai and Beijing (with an equal number in each city) and 30 hotels in Hong Kong were randomly selected from Expedia.com, one of the largest travel portals in the world which provides a wide variety of travel-related services. Since hotels in the low-star category are unlikely to have adopted e-business on a wide scale, only hotels at the level of three stars or above were selected for this study. Wei et al. (2001) echoed such a claim, stating that the use of the Internet increases with a hotel’s star ratings. Table 18.1 lists these randomly chosen hotels and their online addresses.

**Website Dimensions and Attributes**

The dimensions and attributes were adopted from a recently conducted prior study examining the preferences of users with regard to hotel websites (Law and Cheung 2005). With the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotels in Mainland China (Beijing/Shanghai)</th>
<th>Hotels in Hong Kong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Hyatt Shanghai (<a href="http://www.shanghai.grand.hyatt.com">www.shanghai.grand.hyatt.com</a>)</td>
<td>Kowloon Hotel (<a href="http://www.peninsula.com">www.peninsula.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraton Grand Tai Ping Yang (<a href="http://www.sheratongrand-shanghai.com">www.sheratongrand-shanghai.com</a>)</td>
<td>Le Meridien Cyberport (<a href="http://www.lemeridien.com">www.lemeridien.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Seasons Hotel Shanghai (<a href="http://www.fourseasons.com">www.fourseasons.com</a>)</td>
<td>Hyatt Regency Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.hongkong.regency.hyatt.com">www.hongkong.regency.hyatt.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okura Garden hotel Shanghai (<a href="http://www.gardenhotelsshanghai.com">www.gardenhotelsshanghai.com</a>)</td>
<td>Empire Hotel Kowloon (<a href="http://www.asiastandard.com">www.asiastandard.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritz-Carlton Portman Shanghai (<a href="http://www.ritzcarlton.com">www.ritzcarlton.com</a>)</td>
<td>Inter Continental Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.interconti.com">www.interconti.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua Ting Hotel and Towers (<a href="http://www.huating-hotel.com">www.huating-hotel.com</a>)</td>
<td>Island Shangri La Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.shangri-la.com/island">www.shangri-la.com/island</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Jc Mandarin (<a href="http://www.jcmandarin.com">www.jcmandarin.com</a>)</td>
<td>Royal Garden Hotel (<a href="http://www.rghk.com.hk">www.rghk.com.hk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radisson SAS Lansheng Hotel (<a href="http://www.radisson.com">www.radisson.com</a>)</td>
<td>Marco Polo Hongkong Hotel (<a href="http://www.marcopolohotels.com">www.marcopolohotels.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangri La Hotel Shanghai (<a href="http://www.shangri-la.com">www.shangri-la.com</a>)</td>
<td>Regal Kowloon Hotel (<a href="http://www.regalkowloon.com">www.regalkowloon.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Inter-Continental Pudong (<a href="http://www.shanghai.intercontinental.com">www.shanghai.intercontinental.com</a>)</td>
<td>Sheraton Hong Kong Hotel Tower (<a href="http://www.sheraton.com/hongkong">www.sheraton.com/hongkong</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regal International East Asia (<a href="http://www.regal-eastasia.com">www.regal-eastasia.com</a>)</td>
<td>Langham Hotel Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.langhamhotels.com">www.langhamhotels.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott Shanghai Hongqiao (<a href="http://www.marriott.com">www.marriott.com</a>)</td>
<td>The Excelsior Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.mandarinoriental.com">www.mandarinoriental.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Shanghai Hotel (<a href="http://www.equatorial.com">www.equatorial.com</a>)</td>
<td>Harbour Plaza Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.harbour-plaza.com/hphk">www.harbour-plaza.com/hphk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radisson Plaza Hotel Shanghai (<a href="http://www.radisson.com">www.radisson.com</a>)</td>
<td>JW Marriott Hotel Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.marriotthotels.com/hkgdct">www.marriotthotels.com/hkgdct</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianguo Hotel (<a href="http://www.hoteljianguo.com">www.hoteljianguo.com</a>)</td>
<td>Miramar Hotel Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.miramarkh.com">www.miramarkh.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jing Guang New World Hotel (<a href="http://www.newworldhotels.com">www.newworldhotels.com</a>)</td>
<td>The Ritz-Carlton, Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.ritzcarlton.com">www.ritzcarlton.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Wall Sheraton Hotel (<a href="http://www.sheratonbeijing.com">www.sheratonbeijing.com</a>)</td>
<td>The Peninsular Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.peninsula.com">www.peninsula.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro Polo Beijing (<a href="http://www.marcopolohotels.com">www.marcopolohotels.com</a>)</td>
<td>Regal Hong Kong Hotel (<a href="http://www.regalhongkong.com">www.regalhongkong.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Shangri-La Hotel, Beijing (<a href="http://www.shangri-la.com">www.shangri-la.com</a>)</td>
<td>The Park Lane Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.parklane.com.hk">www.parklane.com.hk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinglun Hotel Nikko (<a href="http://www.jinglunhotel.com">www.jinglunhotel.com</a>)</td>
<td>Regal Airport Hotel (<a href="http://www.regalairport.com">www.regalairport.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing Landmark Towers Hotel (<a href="http://www.beijinglandmark.com">www.beijinglandmark.com</a>)</td>
<td>Hong Kong Gold Coast Hotel (<a href="http://www.goldroasthotel.com.hk">www.goldroasthotel.com.hk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Hotel Beijing (<a href="http://www.grandhotelbeijing.com">www.grandhotelbeijing.com</a>)</td>
<td>Luk Kwok Hotel (<a href="http://www.lukkwokhotel.com">www.lukkwokhotel.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Regis Beijing (<a href="http://www.starwoodhotels.com/stregis">www.starwoodhotels.com/stregis</a>)</td>
<td>Marco Polo Prince (<a href="http://www.marcopolohotels.com">www.marcopolohotels.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tianlung Dynasty Hotel Beijing (<a href="http://www.tianlunghotel.com">www.tianlunghotel.com</a>)</td>
<td>Mandarin Oriental, Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.mandarinoriental.com">www.mandarinoriental.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing Hotel (<a href="http://www.chinabeijinghotel.com">www.chinabeijinghotel.com</a>)</td>
<td>Conrad Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.conrad.com.hk">www.conrad.com.hk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Plaza Beijing (<a href="http://www.stateguesthotel.com">www.stateguesthotel.com</a>)</td>
<td>Kowloon Shangri-La, Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.shangri-la.com/kowloon">www.shangri-la.com/kowloon</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowne Plaza Hotel (<a href="http://www.crowneplaza.com">www.crowneplaza.com</a>)</td>
<td>Eaton Hotel Hong Kong (<a href="http://www.eaton-hotel.com">www.eaton-hotel.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Compiled by Author.*
exception of the attribute ‘employment opportunities’, all factors that could potentially influence the functionality performance of a hotel website were retained in this research. The consistency of the evaluation and the homogeneity of the items in the scale were indicated by the high values of Cronbach’s alpha of more than 0.82 for all but one dimension. The alpha value for the dimension of ‘Contact Information’ was acceptable, at 0.75. Overall, there were five dimensions and each of these had five to 10 attributes. Table 18.2 presents the dimensions and their associated attributes.

**Modelling and Evaluations**

Based on the importance of responses in numeric percentages for each individual attribute from the 284 international users of hotel websites, the process of modelling the performance of hotel websites was as follows. First, the relative weightage (importance) of a specific attribute was derived by computing the percentage of the average weightage of this attribute to the sum of the weights of all attributes. A dimension weightage was, thus, a simple extension of the summation of all attributes in the dimension. In other words, the sum of the relative attribute weightages and dimension weightages would each add up to unity. Table 18.2 lists the mean importance provided by the respondents and the derived relative weightage for each attribute and dimension.

After that, multiplying the relative attribute weightage and the corresponding numeric score in the range of zero to five from the attribute rating scale developed by Chung and Law (2003) generated the performance score of an individual attribute. The summation of the attribute performance scores in a dimension, adjusted by a linear factor of one-fifth, yielded the performance score for the dimension. Last, the overall functionality performance score of a website is simply the sum of all dimension scores. It is necessary to mention that the maximum dimension scores are essentially the dimension weightages and the maximum overall performance for a website is, therefore, 100.

The selected hotel websites were evaluated in the period September–November 2004 and the empirical findings are presented in the next section.

**Findings and Discussions**

The performance scores for individual dimensions and the website as a whole of the included hotels in Mainland China and in Hong Kong are listed, in descending order of overall performance scores, in Tables 18.3 and 18.4. (Each hotel in Table 18.1 was assigned a code, and this code is anonymously presented in the hotel codes column in Tables 18.3 and 18.4.)

As indicated in Table 18.3, hotel websites in Mainland China received overall performance scores ranging from 26.33 to 72.75, with an average performance score of 51.02. Similarly, hotels in Hong Kong received overall performance scores from 26.94 to 73.53, with an average
### Table 18.2 Included Website Dimensions, Attributes and Their Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.t.d.</th>
<th>Relative attribute weight</th>
<th>Relative dimension weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Photos of Hotel Features</td>
<td>77.54</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Descriptions</td>
<td>77.03</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Features</td>
<td>81.65</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest Room Facilities</td>
<td>80.30</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Location Maps</td>
<td>83.53</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Promotions</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virtual Tours</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>62.60</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent Guest Programme</td>
<td>58.52</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Facilities</td>
<td>48.98</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>90.22</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>88.85</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax Number</td>
<td>70.39</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Forum</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback Form</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>56.59</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently Asked Questions</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>65.53</td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>Room Rates</td>
<td>93.42</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>28.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Check Rates and Availability</td>
<td>90.23</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online/Real Time Reservations</td>
<td>86.13</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reservation Policies</td>
<td>77.64</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View or Cancel Reservations</td>
<td>81.46</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worldwide Reservations Phone Number</td>
<td>76.47</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security Payment Systems</td>
<td>82.96</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check-in and Check-out Time</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Request Forms</td>
<td>58.61</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payment Options</td>
<td>73.07</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Area</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>81.31</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Airport Information</td>
<td>76.71</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Attractions of the City</td>
<td>73.02</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Information of the City</td>
<td>70.76</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Holidays</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Management</td>
<td>Up-to-date Information on the Site</td>
<td>84.06</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>12.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingual Site</td>
<td>76.80</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Map</td>
<td>71.18</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search Function</td>
<td>70.84</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links to Other Related Businesses</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data.*

*Note: s.t.d: Standard deviation.*
Table 18.3 Performance of Mainland China Hotel Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel code</th>
<th>Facilities information</th>
<th>Contact information</th>
<th>Reservations information</th>
<th>Surrounding area information</th>
<th>Website management</th>
<th>Overall performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>72.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>70.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>65.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>64.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>63.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>61.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>59.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>59.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>58.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>58.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>57.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>57.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>54.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>52.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>52.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>50.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>50.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>50.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>50.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>48.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>43.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>42.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>41.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>39.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>39.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>38.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>31.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>30.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

score of 57.04. Generally speaking, the experimental results revealed that the performance of the hotel websites that were examined was largely satisfactory. Specifically, hotel websites of both regions received the highest scores in the dimension of ‘reservations information’, but the dimension of ‘surrounding area information’ in both regions received the lowest performance scores. These ratings are applicable to both absolute and relative achievements. Such results, however, are not unexpected as hotel practitioners tend to spend more effort on those factors that have a direct relevance to increasing their revenues instead of spending on other factors. It is also interesting to note that the performance of different dimensions of websites
in both regions followed the same order. In other words, hotel managers in Hong Kong and Mainland China followed a similar business approach to website development in the context of functionality.

The comparison of the performances of the websites of hotels in Hong Kong and in Mainland China is presented in Table 18.5. In general, the websites of hotels in Hong Kong received higher scores than their Mainland China counterparts in all measurements. The results of independent sample tests indicated significant differences between the two regions in the dimension of ‘contact information’ and overall performance scores.

### Table 18.4 Performance of Hong Kong Hotel Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel code</th>
<th>Facilities information</th>
<th>Contact information</th>
<th>Reservations information</th>
<th>Surrounding area information</th>
<th>Website management</th>
<th>Overall performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>73.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>69.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>66.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>64.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>62.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>62.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>61.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>61.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>60.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>59.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>59.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>58.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>56.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>56.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>55.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>54.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>52.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>52.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>51.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>51.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>50.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>47.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>46.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>45.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>57.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18.5 Comparison of the Performance of the Websites of Hotels in Hong Kong and Mainland China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Hong Kong Mean</th>
<th>Hong Kong s.t.d.</th>
<th>Mainland China Mean</th>
<th>Mainland China s.t.d.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Information</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>-1.558</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-2.460</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations Information</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>-1.504</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Area Information</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-1.605</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Management</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-0.861</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>57.04</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>-2.176</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$.  
s.t.d: Standard deviation.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary
This study has made an attempt to assess the functionality performance of hotel websites in China. In this research, the websites of hotels in Hong Kong, Shanghai and Beijing were selected as samples. As previously stated, Hong Kong is an international financial centre and Shanghai and Beijing are two major cities in Mainland China, with the former having the largest population and the latter being the capital city of the country. All cities are major tourist destinations in Asia and have experienced rapid growth in tourist arrivals.

Empirically, the websites of Hong Kong based hotels scored higher than those of Mainland China based hotels in all measurements and there were significant differences between these two regions in ‘contact information’ and overall scores. In other words, there is still a difference in performance between hotel websites in Mainland China and Hong Kong. In addition, the general performance of the hotel websites that were included was at a satisfactory—but not at an excellent—level. This satisfactory performance is reflected by the average scores. Naturally, there is room for improvement on most, if not all, of the dimensions of functionality.

Industrial Implications
In view of the ongoing growth of applications of the Internet to the hotel industry, hotel managers should take advantage of this emerging technology and keep refining the contents of their websites. As revealed in this study, hotels in China have set up an online presence and have achieved a certain level of success in certain attributes and dimensions. What hoteliers should do, among other things, is to improve the contents of the dimensions that received low scores. Examples of these dimensions are ‘surrounding area information’ and ‘website management’. It is necessary to re-emphasise that customers perceive all dimensions as the essential components of a comprehensive hotel website and that a weak performance in any dimension would be undesirable to the image of the website and the hotel as a whole.
In addition to the hotels’ own websites, customers can presently book hotel rooms on numerous intermediary websites. It is, therefore, necessary for hotel practitioners to keep improving the usefulness of their websites. As a major part of the usefulness of websites (Lu and Yeung 1998), functionality performance surely deserves more effort from hotel practitioners hoping to remain competitive in an ever-changing business market.

In the past, large online travel agents like Expedia and Travelocity cornered the market on hotel room reservations, and prior studies showed that the room rates offered on a hotel’s own websites were always higher than their rates on other online channels (Shellum 2004b; Tso and Law 2005). Lately, some international hotel groups have been trying to regain control over online markets. One marketing strategy used by these hotel groups is the introduction of lowest rate guaranteed programmes. O’Connor and Frew (2002, 2004) also claim that there are promising opportunities for high-volume growth on the hotels’ own websites. The findings of this research should help shed light for hotel groups, as well as independent hotels, on how to market their products through their own websites, one of the least expensive of sales channels.

Future Research

While the findings of this research appear interesting and would be of use to the hotel industry in China and very likely, to the hotel industries of other developing countries, more work can be done to further investigate the performance of hotel websites in the country. First, the geographic coverage of hotels can be extended in future studies to compare and contrast the findings among the websites of hotels in different regions of China. Some major differences in website performance among different regions are anticipated due to their unequal rates of economic development. Another area open for future research would be to repeat the study in a longitudinal way. Such a longitudinal study would help hoteliers as well as customers better understand the development of websites in different stages of time. Last, future efforts can be made to develop more advanced models on evaluating the performance of websites.
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INTRODUCTION

Perspectives on spatial dimensions of tourist flow patterns, their activities and industrial structure are important in planning, development and management of destinations. And, the nature, intensity and direction of flows lead to evolving valuable insight into the spatial structure of tourism (Pearce 1987) and demonstratively explain tourism’s catalytic role in regional development. Further, as Cornelissen (2005) noted, the structural dimensions of a country’s tourism sector, and in particular the spatial structure of tourism production and consumption, are closely related to the nature and extent of the impact of tourism. Therefore, spatial analysis not only helps in understanding the location and distribution of various tourist related facilities and services or explaining spatial tourism system, but it can also act as logical basis for policy formulation, product development and management, impacts analysis, provision of infrastructure and designing appropriate marketing and promotion programmes.

Nevertheless, the theme has not drawn its deserved level of attention and focus from the scholars and academic journal publishers. As time elapsed, the degree of negligence only grew and McKercher and Lew (2004) observed it as ‘some what surprising’. This is evident in the fact that though there were 77 dedicated academic journals published in the subject areas of tourism/leisure/hospitality in English language in 2003 (as documented by Hall et al. 2004) and one exclusive journal called Tourism Geographies being published since 1999, one could hardly find references of non-micro-level spatial themes while considering the fact that spatiality, irrespective of scales and levels, is a major scope area of geographic enquiries. Most of the existing studies dealing with spatial themes such as space and place are conducted in micro-spaces, viz., village, resort or urban centre levels. The point of contention here is driven not from the focus being attached to micro-space/place inquiries but the lackadaisical and insensitive approach of spatial tourism researchers to various critical manifestations of tourism and its associated phenomena and impacts at larger spatial or geographical levels, such as county, region or nation.
The spatial search in tourism domain is often confronted by two main issues. The first issue is concerned with the problems of developing qualitative and quantitative understanding of tourism development in its spatial context. The commentators attribute this mostly to the incapability of putting together a comprehensive theoretical framework (Mansfeld 1990), or as Ioannides (1995) observed, the existing frameworks are weak and most investigations are related to the supply-side of tourism. In addition, the sector’s ‘diverse and rambling’ nature (Britton 1979), invisibility, perceivably less serious and less acceptable set of activities, peripheral sector characteristics, like mostly unskilled and less-paid workforce, seasonality, predominance of small and medium tourism enterprises (SMTEs), insufficiency of quality data and above all, a disputed ‘industry status’ only accentuated its vows. While addressing the first issue, the second one emerges as supplementary—the importance of developing meaningful spatial analytical tools to suggest the significance of tourism development in vast and diversified countries or regions. This chapter is borne out of the attempt by the author in addressing these two fundamental problematic areas of spatial search/explanations in tourism, in the backdrop of India.

A chronological review of the scholarly inquiries on this subject stands witness to the fact that not only has their numbers been limited, but majority of them were being carried out in the late 1970s and the 1980s (documentation of those can be found in Pearce 1987). A recent study worth citing is of Konadu-Agyemang (2001) on international tourism development in Ghana. It examined two major aspects: factors that contributed to the emergence of Ghana as one of the important tourist destination countries in sub-Saharan Africa and some of tourism’s socio-spatial implications in the background of International Monetary Fund (IMF)/World Bank sponsored economic restructuring programmes. Therefore, the trend since 1990 gives credence to the proposition that non-micro-level spatial studies in tourism have not kept pace with either the advancement in the creation of tourism-based knowledge base or the spatial theory in general.

The reviews further reveal that in addition to inadequate theoretical models, a major factor constraining the understanding of spatial dimensions of tourism is the paucity of relevant and meaningful data and inadequacy of appropriate techniques to investigate the complexity of tourism phenomenon (Pearce 1987). Particularly, at the sub-national and local levels, often the information about the market composition, recreational activity patterns, tourist satisfaction levels and the composition of industry segments are scantily available except in certain isolated cases. Again, testing the validity of distance-decay postulation—whether expressed in actual volume or perceptual/mental maps—mainly within national system could become unworkable for want of relevant data sets. This results in difficulty to initiate meaningful analysis of the impact of tourism at various levels and also formulating appropriate planning, evaluation and control mechanisms. In addition, only little empirical or conceptual work has been conducted for examining and modelling tourism itineraries (Dietvorst 1995; Fennell 1996).
Tourism has tremendous power to act as an instrument of regional development and is very often considered a panacea for alleviating, if not removing, many regional imbalances, as revealed by Pearce (1996). Some major variables being used by analysts for regional/spatial analysis in tourism are accommodation, attraction, the economic impacts and the tourists (Ashworth 1976; Britton, S.G. 1980; Defert 1967, cited in Pearce 1987; Keogh 1984; Mings 1982; Pearce 1979; Rajotte 1977; Tasun et al. 2003). Composite studies incorporating a range of variables and different types of tourism were also undertaken by some scholars (Pearce 1987). Invariably, these studies did report the lack of accurate and quality data at the secondary level, which impede the application of sophisticated analytical tools in the spatial analysis of tourism development. Nevertheless, the earlier studies along with some of the recent ones do legitimately provide insight, at least essential, into the spatial pattern of tourist activities.

**ANALYTICAL TOOLS FOR SPATIAL STUDIES IN TOURISM**

There are many techniques being used for spatial studies in tourism. They have different levels of sophistication. One of the earliest is Defert’s (1967) tourist function index \( T(f) \), which is a measure of density that juxtaposes the visitors and the residents, which Gardavsky (1977) modified later to develop the recreational index \( R(pi) \). Hovik and Heiberg (1980) have formulated tourist intensity \( (TI) \) indicators as primary measures in their study on centre-periphery nature of global tourism, to explain its development and to some extent self-reliance. Due to different reasons, density measures continue to remain as one of the major analytical tools in spatial search as demonstrated in the study of Hans-Werner Schmidt (2002). There are also other indicators like economic, and in some other cases, composite indices being used in spatial analysis of tourism (Britton, S.G. 1980; Mings 1982; Royer et al. 1974; Pearce 1987). Recently, Wen and Tisdell (2001) and Wen et al. (2003) have applied Gini coefficient and Lorenz curve for different socio-economic and tourism-related indicators to form spatial perspectives of tourism development in China.

However, most of the methods mentioned above cannot be used to study the spatial patterns and impacts of tourism, particularly in developing countries, for want of required quantitative and qualitative data. In India, for instance, data available at the secondary level covers mainly two aspects: the tourist volume (both domestic and foreign) and room availability at the state and certain main tourist centres levels. The tourist volumes are expressed discretely in numbers and do not provide any further information on socio-economic characteristics and activity patterns. Whereas the accommodation statistics constitute category-wise distribution — both at state level and at main tourist centres, and its reliability has been challenged due to grossly inadequate coverage, particularly of unclassified and/or unregistered commercial segments in the official statistical framework. Further, visitors staying in non-commercial and supplementary accommodation establishments or in the houses of families or friends are totally uncovered. Although the magnitude of the their economic impacts may not be as significant as those who
stay in commercial accommodations, their impacts are still quite substantial to the economy, society and environment due to sheer volumes.

INDEX OF TOURISM INTENSITY

Given the nature of the data available in India, perhaps the best suited technique would be a concentration measure. Though Defert’s index is a measure of concentration, it cannot be used in the original form because as Smith (1994) pointed out, it is a surrogate measure for the actual importance of tourism. Of the variables used to construct the index, namely, resident population and bed capacity, the bed capacity statistics has many inherent limitations. Due to reasons cited earlier, bed capacity may not be as much a suitable indicator compared to tourist volume statistics. At the same time, converting actual volume figures into a density measure is methodologically suggestive, since it neutralises volume-geographical area discrepancies. In other words, higher volumes do not necessarily mean higher density. For analytical purpose, this study has used the ‘index of tourism intensity’ (ITI) developed by Babu (2006), as a measure of resident population density and tourist density. A higher index would logically suggest that the magnitude of tourism’s impacts on the guests, and more particularly to hosts, could be higher with higher tourist activity intensity. The equation thus can be shown as below:

$$\text{ITI} = \frac{N(i) \times 100}{R(i)}$$

Where, ITI = Index of tourism intensity
N(i) = Tourist population density
R(i) = Resident population density

However, the interpretation of ITI warrants caution because of two reasons: first, higher tourist density need not necessarily translate into higher ITI values where the resident density is higher. Larger resident population might have a strong bearing on the distribution of impacts—both positive and negative. Second, the context of tourism development, type of tourism and tourists might play a critical role as well in the distribution of tourism’s impacts.

The values of T(f) and ITI are postulated theoretically to be different because of the differences in the degrees of tourist activity intensity. Moreover, reliability of ITI measure is methodologically assumed to be higher, since it is more refined and addresses some limitations of the T(f) index highlighted by Smith (1994), such as geographical area/size and discrepancy in accommodation statistics. As the index is a product of two density measures (tourists and resident population), resultant values differs depending on the difference between the two: less the difference, more the index value and vice versa.
Likewise, when tourist density exceeds the resident density, the value exceeds the unity. Further, even if the tourist density is very high, a high resident density can substantially bring down the index, indicating an inverse relationship between them.

As a refined measure of concentration, ITI values have distinct qualities of explaining the nature of concentration of tourist activities, and therefore, can be used for policy and planning exercises. The applicability and significance of the measures of concentration have also been confirmed by Mansfeld (1990) who after reviewing the literature analysing tourist flows concluded that though concentration ratio index is descriptive in nature, when carried out diachronically it enables both the tourist industry and government agencies to monitor and predict future flows.

**INBOUND TOURISM SINCE INDEPENDENCE**

Though the founding fathers of modern India have realised the importance of tourism to India’s socio-economic development, tourism has been a least priority area until a few years ago (Bezbaruah 1999). Ironically, it took almost 35 years after independence, for the country to put in place a tourism policy, and the first tourism policy document came into effect in 1982. In 1990, India embraced a new development philosophy based on economic reforms, focussing on privatisation and globalisation. The sweeping changes in the event of the new economic policy regime have started manifesting in all segments of tourism industry as well—the airlines, road transport, hospitality sector attractions and even in the government machinery. The demand—both internal and external—for opening up Indian skies, the growing competition from the traditional as well as emerging country destinations, changing customer demands, the advancement in information communication technologies (ICT), increasing awareness of the impact of tourism, vocal environmental advocacy/pressure groups in tourism, demand for greater destination-community participation in tourism development process and increasing obligation to sustainable development practices seem to have infused new thinking in evolving policy objectives and strategies, which eventually culminated into the promulgation of new policy for tourism in 2002.

Inbound tourism in India though, of late, has been receiving curious attention from industry professionals, government agencies and a handful of academics, citing the country’s ‘great potential for growth’, and at the same time, surprisingly low foreign visitors turnout. Such curiosity till the 1980s revolved around a ‘euphoric perspective’ of tourism development. But, since then the major stakeholders in tourism have been guided by two major views: first, of those who believe in and practice unrealistically ‘realistic scenario’ projections (as evident in Ahuja and Surna 1977; Sen 1985; Department of Tourism 1987, 1992; WTTC 2001). Other groups, though less vocal, remain cautious on such overt endorsement of the contribution of tourism (Aramberri 2004). It is argued here that the thinking on inbound tourism in India so far has been, at best, at the level of curiosity and the following discussion would substantiate this position.
Though inbound tourism statistics of India manifest a substantial increase in terms of numbers and growth rates, that is, from 17,000 in 1950 to 3.9 million in 2005, it is very insignificant compared to global tourism. A decade-by-decade analysis reveals that up to 1990, while the growth rate was declining, it was comparatively less volatile. But, the growth in the liberalised economic environment (since 1990) has not been very encouraging because of slower growth rate and fluctuating inflow patterns (Table 19.1). Indeed, in the post-liberalised Indian economic context, tourism should have grown faster and steadily due to favourable growth environment, like opening up of the economy, currency devaluation, industry automation, use of information communication technology in marketing and promotion, growth in international trade and the like. But, the reasons for the country’s inbound tourist traffic not growing up to the visualised potential could be attributed to the internal contradictions, supplemented with a volatile global tourism business environment.

Table 19.1 International Tourist Arrivals: World and India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Global tourist arrivals</th>
<th>Annual growth rate (%)</th>
<th>Foreign tourist arrival-India</th>
<th>Annual growth rate (%)</th>
<th>India’s share to world (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>165.89</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>286.24</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>455.90</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>696.70</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>808.00</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tourist Statistics, Department of Tourism, Government of India (respective annual issues).

It is also worthwhile to note that the growth in tourist arrivals in India seems more as a spillover of the overall growth in global tourist arrivals—a natural outcome of the outward shifting of ‘pleasure periphery’. For instance, when the growth of foreign tourist arrivals in post-liberalised India is compared with that of the World for the 1990–2000 period, it is interesting to note that both grew almost at the same pace (around 5.9 and 5.3 per cent, respectively). Compound growth also indicates a similar growth trajectory, dislocating the euphoric scenario of higher growth forecast being made for India. One such example was the National Action Plan for Tourism (NAPT) announced in 1992, which made a forecast that India’s share in world tourism would rise to 1 per cent from 0.4 per cent in 1992, in a five year period. In fact, this was one of the prime objectives of NAPT but it continues to remain an unrealised one.

It is equally striking to note that global tourism grew from strength to strength over the years and many countries located away from the traditional ‘tourism core’ have emerged as new growth centres. Interestingly, India’s comparatively early entry in the global tourism arena could not succeed in making its presence felt, as is evident in just about half a per cent
of global tourist traffic. More so, contrary to global trend of reaching out to the new markets, major stakeholders of Indian tourism seemingly continued with their focus on the traditional West European and North American markets. Though till the 1970s, this approach could make economic sense despite India’s distance from them, because they were also major source regions of global outbound tourism. With global socio-economic realities changing rapidly and the developing parts of the world emerging as strong source markets in the mid-1980s, India should have re-focussed the tourism strategies and programmes; but the evidence suggests that this did not happen, at least until the beginning of the new millennium. What India has failed in was to strategically develop and position its major strengths in cultural richness and diversity—whether cultural or natural heritage—having tremendous power to draw tourists from every region in the world, including ‘cultural affinity’ groups.

The earnings from inbound tourism are also reflective of India’s insignificant position at the global level, though tourism continues to be a major source of foreign exchange. India’s share in the world receipts ranged from 0.57 per cent in 1990 to 0.84 per cent in 2005, that is, USD 1.5 billion and USD 5.7 billion respectively in real terms (Table 19.2). Further, comparison of foreign tourist arrivals and corresponding receipts in India shows that on account of the country’s growth rate and share of the world total, the receipts have been exceeding the arrivals possibly due to longer duration of stay being estimated at about a month, and an increase in average daily spending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>World tourist receipts (billion USD)</th>
<th>Annual growth rate (%)</th>
<th>Tourist receipts – India (billion USD)</th>
<th>Annual growth rate (%)</th>
<th>India’s share to world receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>266.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>406.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>474.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>682.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tourism Statistics, Department of Tourism, Government of India (Respective Annual Issues).

Notwithstanding of the recent studies also confirm the sector’s contribution to the economy. For instance, a study by National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER 2004) using the Tourism Satellite Account (TSA) methodology estimated the value added by tourism at 2.78 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in terms of direct impact, and 5.83 per cent of GDP in indirect effects. Further, though tourism generated employment estimations are often refuted, it would be pertinent to visit some recent studies to gauge the potential of tourism. For instance, the NAPT Report by the Department of Tourism (1992) stated tourism to have generated 13–14 million employments directly and indirectly. The NCAER study stated above estimates tourism’s share in the total number of direct jobs as 4.59 per cent, which rises to 8.27 per cent when indirect effects are also included (estimates do not include...
excursions/same-day tourism). The forecast is also very promising, for, as per the WTTC’s TSA estimation in 2001, total volume of ‘travel and tourism economy’ employment would be around 260.4 million in 2011, which will be to the tune of 9.0 per cent to the total employment, of which direct employment is estimated at 99.3 million. Further, WTTC’s ‘Blueprint for New Tourism’ announced in 2003 suggested that India’s travel and tourism economy employment will grow at 3.85 million in actual terms every year, between 2004 and 2013. Even if one is critical of the accuracy of these figures, citing the reasons of ambiguity and coverage in describing the ‘economy’ and ‘industry’, it can at least be treated as demonstrative of the sector’s potential, given the fact that it is predominantly a small and medium enterprises industry.

PORTS OF DISEMBARKATION OF INBOUND TOURISTS

The ports through which international tourists enter into the intra-national system are often a beginning point for the analysis of intra-national travel patterns (Pearce 1987), which in turn, contribute to evolving spatial perspectives. In a multi-port destination system like India, many factors will determine the entry patterns of foreign tourists. The major factors include purpose of visit, tourism promotion strategies, connectivity with the international travel network, distance between generating and receiving countries, geographical location of major tourist generating regions, and to a large extent, the strategies being adopted by major international carriers. Within the country, various demand and supply factors are expected to influence the travel patterns of tourists. Though the entry points of international tourists at a destination could explain the spatial patterns of their movements within, the scholarly treatment of the subject is very scant (Pearce 1987), and McKercher and Lew (2004) reports that negation by spatial researchers still continues.

In India too, very little is known about the intra-national travel patterns of the tourists—both foreign and domestic. However, one could logically assume that tourism in the countryside/peripheral places is closely connected to the location of international entry point/principal port cities, since they act as points of entry-and-exit in the national system. They also happen to be major tourist destinations and/or act as staging post, sending visitors out to the surrounding regions or along tourist circuits.

For a proper perspective of inbound tourism in India, the mode of transport used by foreign travellers and their entry point could be as a logical starting point. In India, a study by the Central Department of Tourism undertaken in 1965 could form the base, which revealed that 73 per cent of the tourists arrived in India by air and 23 per cent by the sea. But, by 2005, the proportion of tourist arrivals by air is reported as 87 per cent. On the other hand, while the foreign tourist arrival by sea has been reduced to negligible, those arriving by land route have increased to over 13 per cent (Department of Tourism 2005). In other words, the air has traditionally been the main mode of transport for foreign tourism in India and has been gaining more prominence year after year. The reasons for this, perhaps, could be attributed to the farness
from main tourist markets, peninsular position of Indian subcontinent, hostile neighbours who do not encourage easy and hassle-free border—land and/or sea—crossings and the strategic position of India on the round-the-world southern and northern air routes.

Traditionally, India has been served by four major international airports—Mumbai, Delhi, Calcutta and Chennai. Until 1974, Delhi has acted as the main entry point for international tourists, but since 1975 the pattern has changed with Mumbai surpassing Delhi. Mumbai’s emergence as a major entry point in the late 1970s and 1980s could be explained by its nodality and higher connectivity, proximity to Middle East and gradual emergence as the commercial hub (Babu 1991). But, since the 1980s, the proportion of tourist arrivals in Mumbai gradually began to decline and Delhi emerged as the major international entry point (Figure 19.1). At the same time, many other international airports have come up, resulting in the diversion of traffic from Mumbai and Delhi to a great degree. Due to these, the proportion of tourist arrivals in Delhi and Mumbai together has declined to 56.3 per cent in 2005 from over 81 per cent 1987. Perhaps, what has come into reckoning is the gradual emergence of South India as a major point of entry for foreign tourists owing to the location of many international airports, such as Chennai, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Thiruvananthapuram, Kochi and Calicut.

Figure 19.1  Major Ports of Disembarkation—India


From the foreign tourist entry pattern in India, certain logical inferences can be drawn. First, in general, opening of more international airports have not only provided the travellers more option of flying directly to different regions in India but also facilitated dispersion of both inbound and domestic air traffic. Second, the prominence of Delhi as an international entry point since the early 1990s could be attributed to its national capital status, absence of any major international airport in the northern part of the country, its emergence as a vibrant
commercial hub in the North and the presence of diversified tourist attractions in and around Delhi. Third, decline in the share of Mumbai could be attributed to a combination of economic, political and infrastructural reasons. Though Mumbai continues to enjoy the status of being the commercial capital of India, the period since the late 1980s has seen the southern state of Karnataka, particularly its capital city Bangalore, emerging as the focal point of India’s fast growing knowledge economy. Other states in the peninsula and particularly, the cities such as Chennai, Hyderabad and Thiruvananthapuram, have been vying for their share in the country’s knowledge economy pie. The construction or upgradation of many international airports in South India could be seen as a strong indication of India’s emerging economic landscape.

Besides these, the perception gaining momentum that Mumbai is overcrowded, real estate values are among the highest in the world, and the airport infrastructure is inadequate and not of international standard, add up to the woes of the city. Opening of international airports at Kochi and Calicut in Kerala also drew away a sizable portion of Mumbai’s West Asia bound air traffic. A cumulative effect of these developments was being reflected in rescheduling of flights by major international airlines by incorporating other major cities, mainly in the South, to create new routes and economic synergies.

**REGIONAL STRUCTURE OF ACCOMMODATION SECTOR**

Accommodation is an integral component of tourism industry and one of the three fundamental pillars of tourism—transport, accommodation and attraction; and a more striking and tangible manifestation of tourism at the place. The quality, variety and ‘value-for-money’ of accommodation can be a powerful pull factors for a destination (Jafari 2000). As a measure of the importance of tourism industry, the use of accommodation is a logical one, since a stay away from home is one of the defining characteristics of tourism (Pearce 1987), and the study of Wen and Tidsell (2001) reiterated it. Pearce further stated that distribution of accommodation is the most widely used measure of understanding spatial patterns of tourism. Many forms of accommodation are available to modern tourists (Gee et al. 1997), but in general, there has been a move away from the conventional, service-type of accommodation provided by hotels and guest houses to more flexible and functional forms, such as the self-contained motel, the rented apartments, private tents or camping and caravanning (Britton, R.A. 1979; Pearce 1989; Gee et al. 1997).

In India, available statistics of room capacity indicates an appreciable increase over the years and the annual average growth rate has been nearly 27.6 per cent during 1963–2001 (Table 19.3). However, the decline in the growth rate in the period 2001-05 could be attributable to the re-classification and de-classification of accommodation units. Interestingly, among various categories, the five star deluxe and five star hotels grew faster than others. The number of heritage hotel rooms have also witnessed appreciable increase. But the general scenario emerging out of Table 19.3 would assist in inferring that the policies and strategies
of the developers of accommodation were mainly focussed on the luxury tourist segment. However, the hotel statistics and above observations needs to be viewed cautiously because—as mentioned earlier—the statistics analysed here constitute only the registered and/or approved accommodation available in published form.

The recent system of documenting the accommodation statistics of major tourist places and their aggregation at the state levels perhaps could be to provide sufficient insight on the spatial aspects of accommodation distribution (only registered) in India, thereby enabling us to draw inferences about tourist activity patterns in India. Available data reveals that Maharashtra accounted for highest number of rooms among Indian states followed by Delhi and Tamil Nadu. In terms of growth in the room capacity, while certain touristically important states like Rajasthan, Goa and Kerala have recorded substantial growth during this period, other major states like Maharashtra, Delhi, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh had recorded growth rates less than the country’s average of nearly 22 per cent between 1995 and 2005. Ironically enough, some major tourism states in the country have recorded only a small portion of the total registered accommodation, which could perhaps be due to lack of registration of small hotels/lodges and supplementary accommodations, quite typical to these states. Further, though these states may be in the reckoning in terms of tourist numbers, except Himachal Pradesh, others have been identified as underdeveloped states in the country (Planning Commission 2002), which invariably refers to inadequate internal demand for tourism products, low industrial activities and fewer high end tourists, like the business or leisure types.

In addition, most of the major pilgrim centres in India which attract millions of pilgrims every year had only very few registered rooms available, irrespective of whether they are important to Hindu/Muslim/Buddhist/Jain/Sikh faith. This is further suggestive of the grossly inadequate documentation of various types of accommodation, which, as noted by many studies, is a global phenomenon, although of varying degrees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Five star &amp; five star deluxe</th>
<th>Four star &amp; three star</th>
<th>Two star &amp; one star</th>
<th>Heritage hotels</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Total room capacity</th>
<th>Growth rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>7126</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9,012</td>
<td>18,830</td>
<td>151.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td>7,613</td>
<td>7,651</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>14,003</td>
<td>35,332</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>10,303</td>
<td>8,771</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>34,574</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>15,435</td>
<td>9,588</td>
<td>11,922</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>9,811</td>
<td>47,407</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>18,610</td>
<td>20,226</td>
<td>16,048</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>8,397</td>
<td>64,573</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>25,086</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>22,449</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>82,001</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23,106</td>
<td>25,468</td>
<td>7,302</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>9,767</td>
<td>67,173</td>
<td>-18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: For 1963, Hotel Classification report, MoT, Govt. of India. For remaining years, Tourist Statistics, Department of Tourism, Government of India.
SPATIAL PATTERNS OF TOURIST MOVEMENTS

The earliest attempt to capture the spatial dimension of tourist movements in India was made by Anand (1976), who concluded that tourist traffic was concentrated only in few centres; mainly ‘presidency cities’ (Delhi, Mumbai, Calcutta and Madras). In another attempt, Babu (1991), using the data compiled from the foreign tourist survey reports of the Ministry of Tourism, Government of India, covering 53 major tourist centres in the country for the period 1972–73, 1982–83 and 1987–88, drew out the following trends: first, the four ‘presidency cities’ along with few other places, such as Agra, Varanasi, Bangalore, Jaipur and Goa had been dominating India’s tourist scape. Second, there has been a ‘waxing and waning’ effect of the relative importance of tourist centres in India vis-à-vis foreign tourist activities in the country. A typology based on the nature of tourist centres (‘pilgrim and others religious centres’, ‘resorts’—both hill and beach, and ‘business centres’) vividly demonstrates how the foreign tourist activity patterns have been changing in these centres. Third, when the centre-wise data was projected on to a three-dimensional plain, a ‘cone of visitation’ was formed around two major international entry points—Mumbai and Delhi—suggesting that foreign tourism was still demonstrating a greater degree of concentration in the regions around major international entry points. Fourth, this period has also seen the dispersal of foreign tourists away from North India—the main tourist region till the 1970s—to the tourist destinations in the South and South-western region by the mid-1980s.

Perhaps, the patterns observed in the studies of Anand (1976) and Babu (1991) form a logical base for explaining the spatial patterns and characteristics of tourism in the post-1990 era. The state-level data was compiled for 1992 and 2005 to evolve macro-level perspective of tourism development spatially, which are placed in Table 19.4. It shows that in 1992, of the 1.9 million foreign tourists who visited India, the highest number visited Maharashtra followed by Delhi, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. Other states having significant foreign tourist arrivals were Kerala, West Bengal and Goa. On the contrary, data for 2005 suggest that though these states continued to witness higher incidence of foreign tourists, Uttar Pradesh (including Uttaranchal) also emerged as an important destination for foreign tourists.

In general, some important and logical inferences can be drawn from the table. First, though in varying proportions, foreign tourist visitation has increased in all the states. For instance, certain states that had recorded lower foreign tourist visits in the early 1990s have acquired prominence in the itinerary of the tourists in the new millennium. This trend also helps to infer that though foreign tourist flow to India has not been growing at the projected rate, their movements within the country are spreading. Second, though the state-level statistics provide signs of dispersal away from major entry points, maximum visitation continues to be in and around them as evident in the arrival statistics of Delhi, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal and Kerala. Last, factors like location of major attractions, overall development of the states and regions, recent infrastructure development
initiatives, and tourism marketing and promotion activities undertaken by both national and state governments seem to have influenced the foreign tourist movements, and thereby, spatial tourist activity patterns and development process within the country.

Noticeably, this period saw a surge in the domestic tourism in India and by 2005, the volume reached 390 million, recording almost a five-fold increase over 1992. The growth of domestic tourist visitation in all the states has also increased substantially, although with varying growth rates. Most states also have been witness to their changing share in the national domestic tourism scenario; for some, in their favour and for others, adversely. Like in the case of foreign tourism, Uttar Pradesh witnessed a staggering growth in domestic tourist arrivals, that is,

Table 19.4 Domestic and Foreign Tourist Movements within States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh (AP)</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>93.52</td>
<td>560.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>336.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal Pradesh (HP)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>207.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammu &amp; Kashmir (J&amp;K)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>542.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>200.1</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>346.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya Pradesh (MP)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>161.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra (E)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>708.3</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>1448.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orissa</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>547.8</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>1131.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Nadu (TN)</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>414.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>1179.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttar Pradesh (UP)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td>1250.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>132.2</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>895.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E. States</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi (E)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>587.5</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1511.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All India</td>
<td>81.46</td>
<td>1,867.7</td>
<td>390.47</td>
<td>3918.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Tourist Statistics*, Department of Tourism, Government of India (respective annual issues).
Notes: (E) Estimated figures.
1 Figures cover arrival only in Kashmir valley.
2 Combined Jharkhand.
3 Combined Chattisgarh.
4 Combined Uttaranchal.
from a negligible 2.2 per cent in 1992 to a massive 28 per cent of the country’s domestic tourist arrivals in 2005. It can further be seen that during 1992–2005, domestic tourist movements became more spatially concentrated. For instance, while six leading states in 1992 constituted around 76 per cent of the total domestic traffic, the share of four major states was around 71 per cent in 2005.

Further, in politically sensitive Jammu and Kashmir, tourism has grown substantially since 1992 and the estimates show that by 2005, the volume of domestic tourists increased to over 7 million; although foreigners still appear somewhat reluctant, possibly due to safety related reasons. In general, it can be concluded that the states traditionally known for domestic tourism, particularly, those in the South, are growing at a lower pace as compared to the national average. The case of Karnataka is worth specifying since its annual growth has been less than one per cent, though it is hard to suggest reasons for want of conclusive evidence, despite the fact that the socio-economic development in the state has been appreciably high.

**Intensity of Tourist Activities**

The importance of tourism to the socio-economic development in the states has been explained here with the assistance of a concentration measure, namely, ‘index of tourist intensity’ (ITI). To derive index values, the tourist density for the states has been estimated, based on 2001 statistics, since comparable figures for resident population density was available only for this year in the Census publication. The explanation of ITI proceeds with the assumption that, in general, the lesser the density of resident population the more could be the positive impacts of tourism on them and the environment. However, it is to be acknowledged that tourist volume figures used to construct the index is representative in nature and therefore, the conclusions thus drawn may be treated with caution. At the same time, the index derives inherent strength from the simple fact that actual volumes or its relative measures can and do represent the magnitude of the phenomenon quite close to reality. However, as stated previously, multivariate analysis may be a better tool to analyse the complex nature of tourism spatially, but inadequacy of relevant data-sets at national and/or sub-national levels, often constrains such exercises, which is quite true in the case of non/less industrialised nations. These reasons could justify the application of suggested index in spatial studies in countries like India.

According to the 2001 census, the total population in India is 1,027 million. The most populated states—which also happen to be bigger geographically—in the country were Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Bihar. Six major states together accounted for nearly 57 per cent of total population in the country, whereas density-wise, city-state Delhi was the most densely populated and West Bengal stood a distant second, followed by Bihar, Kerala and UP (Table 19.5). These states have population densities much higher than the national average of 324 persons/sq. km. For estimating tourist density, the study has used the aggregate of the
domestic and foreign tourist arrivals in each state. Not surprisingly, the city-state Delhi, which is also the national capital and the main international gateway of India, showed the highest tourist density of 1,453 tourists/sq km. Goa stood second but much lower at 353.2 tourists/sq km and UP, AP and TN follow the order downward (Table 19.5). However, majority of the states have tourist densities less than the national average of 74.8 tourists/sq km and this further reinforces the understanding derived earlier that spatial patterns of India’s tourist scape appear highly polarised and ‘strong pockets’ and ‘weak pockets’ (pocket stands for the State) of tourist activities do exist.

Perhaps, tourist density figures raise some vital questions. What is the nature of relationship between the tourist density and population density? Do tourists prefer to holiday at comparatively less-densely populated destinations? Or, is it the location of major tourist attractions? In the case of India, are they predominantly cultural or likely to affect the tourist

Table 19.5  Population Density, Tourist Density and Intensity — India, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Total population (in lakh)</th>
<th>Area in Sq. km</th>
<th>Population density</th>
<th>Tourist density</th>
<th>Index of tourist intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>75.73</td>
<td>2,75,045</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>191.0</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>82.88</td>
<td>94,263</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>353.2</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>1,96,024</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>44,212</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.P.</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>55,673</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J&amp;K</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1,01,716</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>52.73</td>
<td>1,91,791</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>38,863</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.P.</td>
<td>81.18</td>
<td>4,43,446</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>11.6*</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>96.75</td>
<td>3,07,713</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>30.5**</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orissa</td>
<td>36.71</td>
<td>1,55,707</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>50,362</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>56.47</td>
<td>3,42,239</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>7,096</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>62.11</td>
<td>1,30,058</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.P.</td>
<td>166.01</td>
<td>2,41,080</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>285.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>80.22</td>
<td>88,752</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E. States</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>2,55,083</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>9294</td>
<td>1453.0**</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttaranchal</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>53,331</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>113.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>79,614</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All India</td>
<td>1,027.02</td>
<td>31,66,743</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: * Combined figures since tourist arrival data for Chhattisgarh is not available separately.
** Estimated figures.
visitation? When tourist density was juxtaposed against the population density of each state to derive ITI, three major trends emerged. First, as postulated, higher ITI values were estimated for those States with higher tourist density and relatively lower population density. The best examples are Goa and Himachal Pradesh. In Uttaranchal, where the tourist density exceeded the population density, highest ITI value of 113.2 was recorded as against the national average of 23.1 (Map 19.1). Second, even if the tourist density is high, a higher population density would result in lower ITI values. Delhi being the best example had a ITI value of just 1.5. Other states like Andhra Pradesh and Kerala had higher tourist density but the higher population density in these states have led to comparatively lower ITI values. Third, when both the density figures are moderate and the difference between them becomes marginal, resultant ITI index emerge comparatively higher.

To establish further the relationship between population density and tourist density, the states were ranked in the descending order and the rank correlation was worked out using Spearman’s coefficient. The result indicates a comparatively weak correlation ($r = 0.36$) between these variables and the coefficient is significant only at 0.1 level, which lead us to conclude that higher population density need not necessarily be associated with higher tourist density. At the same time, it would not be logical to suggest that tourists would prefer destinations which are less populated as the patterns emerged are not suggestive of this. For deriving such a conclusion, correlation should have been weaker or negative. It can, therefore, be concluded that in order to arrive at precise explanations, it is necessary to examine major factors like the complexities of tourist behaviour, drawing power of major attractions, professional efforts by respective state governments, approach of the Central government towards states, the status of infrastructural networks including connectivity and overall socio-economic development.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The review of available literature and subsequent analysis of the state-level data since the early 1990s reveals specific patterns of tourist activities emerging in India. The major trends identified in this study can be summarised as: first, the foreign tourist arrivals have been increasing over the years but a year-by-year pattern is demonstrative of great variability. Again, domestic tourism is very huge and incomparably high in terms of both gross and annual growth figures and is indisputably the major component of tourism for the country and the states. As far as foreign tourism is concerned, there appears a strong link between the presence/absence of international entry points and the distribution of tourists. In general, the states having such entry point(s) or those adjacent to entry point(s) have a high incidence of foreign tourist activities. The geographic location of major overseas tourist markets also seems to have contributed in shaping the spatial pattern of tourism in India. Second, in general, though both foreign and domestic tourist activities in India have been demonstrating seasonal cycles,
Map 19.1  Index of Tourist Intensity 2001

Source: Author.
namely, peak, trough and shoulder; in recent years, the variations between them have been reducing gradually. Third, while looking at both accommodation and tourist arrival statistics across the states, it is evident that tourist activities have been concentrated more in certain states over the years. Last, ITI could be used effectively as a representative measure to explain the spatial dimensions of tourist activities and their impacts in relation to resident population and geographical area.

The statistics analysed here further suggest tourism development possibilities and potentials for the country and the states. Undoubtedly, domestic tourism holds the key for the future of tourism in India and a clear imperative for evolving a tourism development model. This is not only because of its sheer volume and revenue generation (T&T consumption for personal and business travel worth USD 21.9 billion in 2004, according to WTTC 2005) but equally important are its reliability, consistency, non-resiliency and less volatility in contrast to international tourism—a trend that is echoed in Arramberry’s (2004) analysis as well. This conclusion is well founded due to many reasons: the size of a fast growing middle class in India, which is almost equal to the size of the population of West Europe (over 300 million people with individual purchasing power of approximately Rs 2,00,000/year), increasing proportion of senior citizens, high economic growth (more than 6 per cent in 2004–05 and projected to grow more than 7 per cent in the near future) and a fast changing macroeconomic environment. In addition, prominence of services sector in the economy (contribution is more than half of the GNP at present), better infrastructure including transport, widening of access to information and intensive promotional campaign of the Central and State governments re-affirm the critical nature of domestic tourism in India’s tourism development schemes (Babu 2003). The growth in national per capita income (IPC) has been highly appreciable, particularly in the post-liberalised period. According to the Central Statistical Organisation (CSO) estimates, growth in IPC during 1993–94 and 2003–04 stood at 5.3 per cent average per annum from the base of Rs 7,690 (Mohanty 2005), although this does not describe the pattern of distribution.

The CSO estimates further demonstrate the impressive growth in per capita income in most of the states as well, and more particularly, in the major domestic tourist generating states, such as West Bengal, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra. In addition, the dynamic and competitive domestic aviation sector is poised to take domestic tourism to new highs and this optimism was evident in the recent projections suggesting an annual growth of over 20 per cent from 18.6 million passengers in 2004–05, for the coming three to five years (Jet Airways 2005).

A national level survey conducted by the National Council for Applied Economic Research (NCAER) in 2004 is indeed revealing about the domestic travel pattern in India. The survey reveals that around 44 per cent (that is, 87 million) households in India are tourist households, of which 75 per cent are located in rural areas. The social composition of them is equally interesting. It shows that nearly 58 per cent of the tourist households constitute socially and economically backward sections and they mainly depend on agriculture. More than one-third were landless and another one-third marginal and small farmers. Another recent survey
undertaken by National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) came up with startling results of farm households’ access to information, which showed that 40 per cent of Indian farmer households were already accessing information from different sources. Though the theme of the survey pertained to agri-technology, it speaks immensely about the access to information in general, whether visual and audio or to a great degree through the print media. These are also the major sources of tourism-related information, such as transport modes, hospitality sector attractions, marketing and promotion of tourism firms and so on. Many scholarly inquiries in different developing countries (Cornelissen 2005; Wen et al. 2003; Tasun et al. 2003) have also testified the critical position of domestic tourism in the sustainable development of these tourism economies.

Based on the trends observed, it can be concluded that spatial disparity in tourist activities is an issue that warrants immediate attention of the appropriate agencies, both at the State and Central levels because unless appropriate measures are taken at the respective levels, the disparities across the states manifested in the form of ‘strong pockets’ and ‘weak pockets’ of tourism cannot be reduced or, if at all, abolished. The absence of meaningful focussed interventions, in the form of both policies and programmes, would only lead to further accentuation of the disparity (Babu 2006). It is heartening that the government agencies have already acknowledged the great potential of integrated rural development through tourism. For instance, the Union Minister for Tourism states:

… the Government endeavours to position tourism as a major engine of economic growth and harness its direct and multiplier effects for employment and poverty eradication in an environmentally sustainable manner. For this, rural tourism is being promoted as a primary product, besides expanding the scope of cultural tourism, coastal tourism, wildlife and adventure tourism.

—address to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Tourism, February 2007

Last, modified concentration measure of ITI can be a meaningful tool to demonstrate the regional patterns of tourism but the product derived through this calls for cautious and logical interpretations considering the discrete nature of the data used and also the complex nature of tourism and its impacts. To capture the complexities of tourism’s impacts on various components of the destination, such as economy, society and environment, a comprehensive data collection mechanism covering the detailed profiling of the tourists and the destination are to be devised at all appropriate levels.
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Holiday Attachment

The construct and its measurement

BABU P. GEORGE

INTRODUCTION

Serious attempts have been made to construct a reasonably valid and reliable scale to measure residents’ and tourists’ attachment to places (Moore and Graefe 1994; Williams and Roggenbuck 1989). Also, instances can be cited where the place attachment scale is employed to measure tourists’ attachment to holiday destinations. However, a destination is just a component, howsoever important a component it may be, of the complex chain of products and services that structure the holiday experience of a tourist. In addition, the approach of knowing an integrated whole as the mere sum of its parts is criticised as fundamentally flawed at an epistemological level. For Piaget (1973), such an act is a cruel mockery of the nature of social reality. This being the case, it may seem quite strange that nobody has attempted to define and measure a construct broader in scope than place attachment that encompasses tourists’ attachment to the integrated holiday experience as a singular whole. In the present chapter, an attempt is made in that direction and the resultant is the development of a construct and a standardised, general, valid, reliable, multi-item, multi-dimensional instrument to measure it, to which the name Holiday Attachment is given.

We understand a holiday as the name for that integrated and fully inclusive tourism product that encompasses the experiences of the tourist before, during and after the trip (Uzzell 1984). Holidays may be regarded as society’s institutionalised means of enabling fantasy and reality to be imperceptibly mixed. Holidays could be alternatively conceived as narratives, myths, empirical network relationships, marketing objects, and production, information and consumption systems. From this standpoint, Holiday Attachment encompasses the collection of meanings, beliefs, symbols, values and feelings that tourists associate with particular holidays.

The tourism industry provides holiday seekers with a complex bundle of tangible objects and intangible experiences, designed to satisfy their needs and wants (Leiper 1995). This bundle includes facilitation of sorts, primarily, in the realisation of the moment of truth experience at the destination; then, in fulfilling the different information needs (categorised temporally as
ongoing, pre-purchase, planning, en route and after-trip needs of information) of the tourist; and then, those activities aimed at extending customer relationships beyond the immediate peripheries of a holiday. The information provision serves the function of a surrogate of the moment of truth experience, by which the travel industry is weaving around the tourist a framework for a positive reception of the holidaying experience.

Available evidence from tourism research implies that tourists’ choice set or its structure is not static but varies across both consumers and circumstances (Dommermuth 1965; Rewtrakunphaiboon and Oppewal 2003). However, within this general understanding, Ryan (1997) explores society’s earlier attitudes towards holidaying, motivations for holidays, interaction with service providers as they affect the quality of the tourist experience, and the nature of the holiday location and the events that occur there. Dimanche et al. (1993) present an examination of the current literature related to four prevalent topical areas associated with holidaymakers’ decision behaviour: ego involvement, loyalty and commitment, family decision making and novelty seeking. Then, there are specific attempts to categorise tourists’ purchase decision behaviour on the basis of the type of holiday motivation (Thomas 1964; Gray 1970; McIntosh and Goeldner 1995).

Essentially, a holiday is about the purchase of a benefit, which could be an emotional, intellectual or spiritual experience (Nickerson and Ellis 1991). Sometimes, the holiday experience can be cathartic due to its potential to sustain or change peoples’ lifestyles (Hyde 2003). According to Havitz and Dimanche (1999), the quintessence of a holiday is the psychological state of motivation, arousal or an interest between an individual and recreational activities or related equipment, tourist destinations and those various amenities offered, characterised by the perception of the elements of importance, pleasure value, sign value, risk probability and risk consequences. Gray (1970) identified wanderlust and sun-lust as two important motivators triggering touristic pursuit. Krippendorf’s (1986) search for balance, Dann’s (1977) anomie and ego-enhancement, Cohen’s (1979) search for authenticity, Mannell and Iso-Ahola’s (1987) two-dimensional motivational forces of seeking and escaping and Pearce’s (1982) travel career ladder are some of the other noteworthy attempts to structure tourist disposition, motivation and behaviour. However, there is little agreement found among researchers regarding the relative positioning of any specific motivator vis-à-vis others or relative importance among these in inspiring tourists of different categories to make holiday purchases.

Besides these, Mathieson and Wall (1982) also attempted to categorise the motivational factors that determine tourists’ holidaying behaviour. Their typology is an expansion of Crompton’s (1979) two categories of motivation: socio-physical or push motivator (a combination of the natural and social environments) and cultural or pull motivator. They identified physical, cultural, personal and prestige related motivations. These are the tourism-specific variants of the generic benefits sought by a typical customer, known in the general marketing literature by wide ranging names like (a) functional, practical and emotional play off, (b) instrumental and expressive, (c) functional and psychological, (d) use, convenience in use,
integrative and economy, (e) functional, experiential and symbolic (Parry 2000; Woodside and Lysonski 1989). Holidaymakers are expected to appreciate their holiday more or less along these dimensions (Gilbert and Abdullah 2002).

In Mathieson and Wall’s classification presented in the preceding paragraph, the physical motivators are the search for improvement of mind and body: convalescence for health problems, exercise through golfing, playing tennis and hiking, and relief from psychological enervation by searching out the exciting, the romantic or the entertaining. Cultural motivations derive from curiosity about unusual places and foreign locales. The main personal motivation for taking a holiday is to visit family or friends. Other personal motivations include the desires to experience new places and people, make new friends, escape a mundane social environment (to leave the house behind, to escape for the weekend or to reduce stress and relax) and travel. Leiper (1990) notes that there is no evidence that any destination or attraction ever pulled any tourist in the absence of push factors. That is, the beginning of tourism is with push factors and tourist motivation and decision making behaviour has necessarily to be studied in terms of the buyers’ personal values. Though not originally indented by Mathieson and Wall, along with personal motivators buyers’ personal values may be added the concept of self or identity. This is because tourists often seek in holidays those concepts existing in their conceptual structures that they believe as truly characterising them (Lee-Hoxter and Lester 1988). Russel Belk (1988) notes that external objects to which individuals are effectively attached and which are considered as parts of individuality, comprise the extended self and these objects are highly congruent with the individual’s sense of self. When every holiday in the list of choices offers the same utility or meta-experiential options, consumer behaviour becomes an identity project (Thompson and Tambyah 1999) and identity almost wholly determines the purchase decision (Holcomb 1999).

Holidays are purchased and experienced in a meta-experiential setting, though this background itself does not form the experiential product. This background may, at the best, structure consumer experience in unique ways. It broadly dictates what is preferable and what is to be experienced (Steele 1981). The concepts of situationality developed by Bloch and Richins (1993) and later modified by Crick-Furman and Richard (2000) and the working or activated self concept of McGuire and McGuire (1988) suggest that individuals focus on whatever aspects of themselves that are most relevant in a particular social setting or situation. Cranach (1992) illustrates each one’s cultural context as the background with reference to which touristic experiences are interpreted. To raise one’s prestige or status is an oft-cited reason for purchasing a holiday. Again, it is the socio-cultural context that predominantly defines what is prestigious. Normally, prestige is accomplished by fostering socially preferable associations with people, places or events. Prestige enhancement may also be through the pursuit of hobbies, continuation of education, ego enhancement and sexual indulgence. Furthermore, this motivation could also include simply doing what is in fashion. In this regard, Bourdieu’s (1984) reflection that consumption in modern societies acts as a symbolic statement about consumers as individuals
and about their lifestyles, and in this way consumption encourages differentiation based on symbolic capital, is extremely significant.

To fulfil the aforesaid motivational needs, holidaymakers can purchase a pre-packaged holiday or can even purchase them in units and then bundle them together. Packaged holidays are standardised, quality controlled, repeatable offers comprising two or more elements of transport, accommodation, food, destination attractions and other facilities and services, such as travel insurance (Middleton 1994). Independent holidaymakers essentially purchase the same thing, with the only distinction that they feel for themselves the ownership of the bundling effort as well as the risks and benefits associated with that effort. But, there is no reason to expect that there will be emergence of any new dimension of purchase motivation in kind for these self-help holidaymakers vis-à-vis the buyers of a fully inclusive holiday. The differences will only be in ‘degrees’ along the already existing dimensions, say, if there is any motivational value involved in bundling the holiday elements oneself. In other words, the performance evaluation of holidays by holidaymakers should be invariant to the specific nature or characteristic of the holiday.

Continuing with the preceding discussion, dimensions of holidaymakers’ motivation may be thought of as composed of function or utility, emotion, self or identity, and symbolism or context. Individuals by and large must be deriving sense of their holiday consumption along these three dimensions. Moreover, it must be along these dimensions that holidaymakers evaluate what they think the holiday can do for them. Zaichkowsky (1985) also seems to be arguing along the same direction while discussing about her involvement construct, developed to capture the concept of individuals’ perceived relevance for products based on inherent needs, values and interests. Taking cues from Bloch and Richins (1993), and Houston and Rothschild (1978), she categorised involvement into physical, personal and situational. In fact, it was pondered enough apropos using the phrase ‘holiday involvement’ instead of ‘holiday attachment’ for the proposed scale, since what was envisaged was to measure something like involvement for the product-service bundle, namely a holiday; but noticing that a critical mass of related studies in the area of leisure, recreation and tourism has already employed the term ‘attachment’, it was decided to settle down for the present terminology, ‘holiday attachment’. Most of the above-mentioned studies are about the place attachment construct (Bricker and Kerstetter 2000; Moore and Graefe 1994; Proshansky et al. 1983; Stokowski 1991; Vaske and Kobrin 2001; Warzucha and Lime 2001; Williams and Roggenbuck 1989), which measures the meanings, beliefs, symbols, values and feelings that individuals or groups associate with a particular locality (Tuan 1977), say, a tourist destination (Moore and Scott 2003). Additionally, it was felt that supplementary studies could posit holiday attachment as a logical extension of the existing literature on place attachment, in particular, and the more generic attachment theory (Goldberg and Kerr 1995) available in the psychology literature. Again, as Schultz et al. (1989) argue, attachment, as opposed to involvement, is directly associated with the fundamental self-developmental processes that span the entire life cycle and attachment’s temporal element
has no counterpart in involvement. Attachment often has to do with memories and previous self-definitional experiences as well as current or anticipated ones, whereas involvement concerns mostly with the present only. So, too, is the variable of customer satisfaction, as it is operationalised in the mainstream literature. For instance, the HOLSAT scale (Tribe and Snaith 1998) developed to capture satisfaction with holidays has most of its item statements aimed to measure tourists’ instantaneous and immediate impressions of holidays.

**Holiday Attachment and Its Dimensions**

Following the literature available, holiday attachment was anticipated by the author as a three-dimensional construct and he defined it in terms of the significance of the holiday to the individual traveller. It may be noted that widely accepted measures of place attachment, in fact, included only two dimensions: place dependence and place identity (Proshansky et al. 1983; Williams et al. 1995; Williams and Roggenbuck 1989). However, some of the items that were initially generated (given in the Appendix to this chapter) as part of the holiday attachment scale development process gave adequate suggestion that these could better form a meaningful third block and hence these items were tentatively grouped together and named as holiday contextuality. ‘Utility’ refers to the physical components of the holiday that tend to cause dependence or functional association with the holiday. It refers to the more intrinsic advantages of the service consumption and usually corresponds to the product related attributes. It may be operationalised in terms of how the current holiday compares with alternatives in satisfying the activity level needs of tourists or its ability to facilitate behaviour stemming from such needs.

‘Identity’ stands for one’s inherent values, beliefs, interests or needs that constitute one’s conception of own self and that which motivates one towards certain types of holidays, since such holidays are assumed to be symbolic of these values, beliefs, interests or needs. Holiday identity implies affective or emotional attachment with a holiday. Putting slightly differently, it refers to what it ‘feels like’ to partake in the holiday. Identity may be operationalised in terms of a combination of attitudes, values, thoughts, beliefs, meanings and interpretations that tourists associate with a certain holiday and the behavioural tendencies branching from these.

‘Contextuality’ refers to something that increases one’s interest towards the holiday due to contextual particularities. Context is the information available to a particular individual on a particular occasion for use in the meaning ascription process (Clark and Carlson 1981). It refers to advantages that are extrinsic and not immediate to the process of consumption. Its correspondence is to the extra-product related necessities, like the need for societal approval and outer-directed self-esteem (Wallendorf and Arnould 1988), or at times the facilitatory conditions for the actual consumption experience. It may be thought of as those meta-features, which influence the selection of a holiday but do not form the bases for the immediate holiday experience. Individuals, as decision makers, recognise and work within the constraints of the known contextualities in order to achieve the desired outcomes. Individuals may value
the prestige, exclusivity or fashionability of a brand because of how it relates to their outward directed self (Snyder 1974; George and Mekoth 2004). They may behave in manners preferable to the societal context, for instance, and if certain holiday types have higher social preference values in the current context, they may develop attachment towards such holidays.

The above categorisation is congruent with the multifaceted but enmeshed concept of the human self in its enfolding. It is to be noted that holiday utility and contextuality stand more along the performance dimension (what the object is ‘for’), while holiday identity stands more along the attribute dimension (what the object ‘is’) of the self. But, holiday contextuality is distinguished from holiday utility in that it is not the intrinsic physical or activity based needs per se that causes attachment in the former case, but rather, the situational particularities working behind these needs. Again, since holiday contextuality constitutes the attempts made by individuals for self-cultivation within the context provided by the external environment (Csikszentimihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981), there is some comparison apparent between holiday contextuality and holiday identity, except for the notable difference that the former is about the propagation of a socially suitable self or about the enhancement of the self-concept through the transfer of socially accepted meanings of products or brands to oneself, while the latter is about attempts to experience the intrinsic self as reflected in the objects of consumption.

Recapitulating, attachment, a relationship orientation variable, is a multi-dimensional property representing the types and degrees of linkages between an individual and the object of his consumption, existing neither in him nor in the object nor in the context, but rather in the intersection of the three (Schultz et al. 1989). Holiday attachment is a holidaymaker’s overall bond of association with a holiday based on the above three components. These components brew together the salient beliefs individuals have (Myers 1985) about a holiday and their evaluative judgments about those beliefs are expected to form an important basis for understanding their intentions and behaviour, especially loyalty and repurchase behaviour.

**The Scale Development Process**

The procedure commonly adopted to develop a preliminary measure involves the following steps at a minimum (Jackson 1971; Ruekert and Churchill 1984; Zaichkowsky 1985): defining the construct to be measured, generating items that pertain to the construct, judging the content validity of the generated items, determining the internal reliability of the items, determining the temporal stability of the internally reliable items, measuring the content validity of the selected items as a whole, measuring the criterion-related validity and testing the construct validity of the scale.

An important question in any scale development is how many items does it take to measure a construct. A construct with a wide domain and multiple dimensions will require more items to adequately tap the domain and dimensions than a construct with a narrow domain.
However, this concern often gets moderated due to the need for scale brevity, given that scales are self-administered and respondent fatigue and non-cooperation is higher for longer questionnaires (Bearden et al. 1993). Initially, a list of 74 items (see Appendix) was generated, after reviewing literature and our own case study inferences with a view to tap the domain of the construct. This is, according to us, a judicious mix of rational and empirical approaches to generate items.

Given below are some of the sample talks from interviews with tourists that gave broad indication of the dimensions:

*The beaches here are so clean … calm … and the best for swimming.*

*Travelling by that bullock-cart was great … I enjoyed sitting back and taking the stunning rural scenery… I can show these photos to my friends back home.*

*Well, the timings were wonderfully synchronised … everything was arranged perfectly … nice stay, good food … and what not!*  

(Indicative of holiday utility)

*This holiday was a pilgrimage for me … now I know who I am.*

*It’s something which I have been carrying along with me from childhood in my most cherished dreams … now I discovered it … or, it discovered me!*

*Hey … I don’t know how to tell about this experience … but, I can hear my heart singing tunes in its praise.*  

(Indicative of holiday identity)

*Most in my friends-circle have been here … I was feeling ashamed to tell them I haven’t been yet.*

*Look here … this is my darling … it was for her that I’m here too. She loves this holiday to her heart and swayed me.*

*As for me, my first and final concern is that I should reach back home safely. Everything else is secondary.*  

(Indicative of holiday contextuality)

The initial items were refined and edited for judging the content validity by a group of four experts who were faculty members or doctoral candidates in the area of consumer behaviour with domain expertise in tourism. The judges were asked to rate each statement in terms of its ability to represent holiday attachment in general and its proposed three dimensions in particular. Each statement was rated on the following three-point scale: (a) clearly representative of holiday attachment, (b) somewhat representative of holiday attachment and (c) clearly unrepresentative of holiday attachment. Average rating for each statement was calculated. Statements that were rated as clearly not representative of holiday attachment were dropped right away and those rated as clearly representative of holiday attachment were accepted. Those statements
that came under the somewhat representative category were given for brainstorming at a session (all referees were brought together in a chat room), some of them were accepted and remaining ones rejected based on broad consensus. Some suggestions from the judges intending to reduce the net number of items, while not compromising face validity, were incorporated into the re-coining of the statements. In the end, 21 items passed the judgment. Same procedure was adopted to judge the allocation of these items across the proposed dimensions, too. A few of the statements were judged as more constitutive of another dimension than the one originally anticipated by the researchers and reorganisation of the statements was done accordingly. As expected, most divergent views among judges in this regard propped up in the matter of certain items, which, according to some judges, belonged to the holiday utility dimension while others argued that they constituted the holiday contextuality dimension. Again, a final decision about the fate of these items was kept pending till the data was collected and confirmatory factor analysis was done.

In the next stage, the selected items were administered among 80 graduate students of the university who had recently taken part in different types of holiday activities, to examine the scale reliability and further assessment of validity. Six point Likert-type scales were used for the statements. A six-point scale comprising ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ was used to indicate the degree of a respondent’s agreement or disagreement with each item expressed in the form of statements. Positive statements were scored from 1 to 6 for ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘agree a little’, ‘disagree a little’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ responses and negative statements were reversed in scoring from 6 to 1 on responses of ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. The questionnaire was re-administered among the graduate students after a gap of one month to see the temporal consistency. They were asked to recall the same holiday about which they had responded previously, and reply.

The aggregate and component wise responses of a few student respondents who were known to have been religiously adhering to certain holidays and purchased the same were further examined to see if both tallied. This was to check ‘known group validity’. The results were re-checked with them for verification. However, this remained as a simple, informal, qualitative procedure, with no claim of statistical significance for the results. To test ‘discriminant validity’, place attachment scale was (Williams and Roggenbuck 1989) found to be a reasonably good choice. In the statements constituting the original place attachment scale, wherever the word ‘place’ appeared, it was substituted with the word ‘holiday’ and was administered among the same students.

Some of these graduate students were also respondents to another study, conducted by the researcher involving the HOLSAT construct. The HOLSAT scale developed by Tribe and Snaith (1998) is effective in understanding the P-E (Perceptions minus Expectations) gap paradigm and is an improvement upon the existing holiday satisfaction measures. It offers a valid measurement of tourist satisfaction with holidays. The data collected from this previous survey was put to use to examine convergent validity. It was hypothesised to have a strong,
positive correlation between these two constructs. Test of nomological validity was done upon the assumption that holiday attachment will significantly predict holiday loyalty or, holiday attachment will be an important antecedent of holiday loyalty. Nomological validity would be demonstrated if the holiday attachment scores are positively and significantly correlated with the scores on the loyalty construct for the same respondents.

Findings from Validity and Reliability Analysis

Votes from four judges were sought on each of the 21 variables falling into the three dimensions (For instance, all the four judges voted V1 as belonging to holiday utility; 2 out of 4 voted V21 as belonging to holiday identity and the remaining 2 voted it as belonging to holiday contextuality). Also, the single measure intra-class correlation (an index of the ratings of a typical single judge), the average measure intra-class correlation (an index of the reliability of all the judges averaged together), the alpha coefficient and Kendall’s Tau’ correlations between pairs of judges were determined.

Factor Analysis for Examining the Scale Dimensions

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy value was around seven. Four components met Kaiser’s criterion, but other components seemed elusive to making any good sense of interpretation. In fact, the scree plot suggested one more dimension. But, the inclusion of this fourth dimension could have in no way gelled with the prior theoretical assumptions that guided the research.

However, the scale’s empirical factor structure somewhat clearly reflected its theoretical dimensionality with the limiting of factors to three. The 21 items that were loaded onto the theoretically sound three dimensions are displayed in Tables 20.2 and 20.3. The common thread interlinking most of the items in the first factor is, as hypothesised, holiday utility. Holiday identity is the underlying commonality among variables in the second factor and holiday contextuality in the third. The variance explained by these factors individually and the cumulative variance is summarised in Table 20.1. The confirmatory factor analysis results are presented in Table 20.2.

Table 20.1 Variance Explained by the Three Components of Holiday Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rotation sums of squared loadings</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.033</td>
<td>28.727</td>
<td>28.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.483</td>
<td>21.349</td>
<td>50.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.990</td>
<td>18.998</td>
<td>69.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holiday Attachment

Table 20.2 Factors Constituting Holiday Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to do the most likeable things in life</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best mix of activities and comforts</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction to recreation activities</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best mix of attractions</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superb food, stay, and transit</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday a classic time-resource</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management case appropriate itinerary design</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service of reliable support staff</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identification with the holiday</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy holiday for its own sake</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday has a beautiful heart and soul</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate holiday experiences to other aspects of life</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday as the real-life embodiment of an ideal world</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness even if some segment of holiday fails</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated services for the continuation of holiday</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural admiration for takers of holiday</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer relationship extending beyond trip</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-cycle stage favourable for holiday</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick and fair redress in case of problems</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday addresses privacy and security concerns</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness of loved ones through holiday purchase</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.
(Loadings below 0.6 suppressed for clarity)

Reliability analysis (alpha) was conducted for the scale as a whole (Table 20.3) and then for each of the components constituting the scale. The rule of thumb for reliability analysis, according to Nunnally (1978), is that reliability level of 0.70 will suffice in exploratory settings, though in those applied settings where important decisions are made, a minimum reliability coefficient of 0.90 is a must. The overall alpha value was determined to be 0.8570. Note also that no corrected inter-item correlation fell below 0.3, which is a positive signal of the internal consistency of the scale. ‘Alpha, if item removed’ column gives figures, none of which is above the aggregated alpha value for all the items taken together. This means that the overall internal stability will be negatively affected if any variable is removed from the membership in the scale. Alpha values arrived at from the dimension wise analysis are as follows: Alpha (holiday utility) = 0.9464; Alpha (holiday identity) = 0.9021; Alpha (holiday contextuality) = 0.8991. The alpha value for no component fell below the alpha value for the overall scale. Theoretically, the dimension stability should be higher than the overall stability for the scale.

Hence, this condition is also satisfied for the present scale.
Test-retest reliability was examined using Pearson bivariate correlation technique for the holiday attachment scores taken at two time periods in a gap of approximately one month for 50 of the respondents and was found to be equal to 0.786, significant at p < 0.01. To test convergent validity, the correlation between HOLSAT and holiday attachment was examined for 60 respondents, which revealed a significant (p < 0.001) correlation of 0.61 between the two constructs. To examine discriminant validity, the correlation between place attachment and holiday attachment was calculated, which yielded a correlation of 0.226 between the two constructs. However, this was noted to be non-significant, which means that it is difficult to generalise the conclusion that place attachment and holiday attachment discriminate from one another. Regression analysis keeping holiday attachment as the independent variable and holiday loyalty as the dependent variable, was performed and it was noted that the model non-optimistically explains 52.1 per cent variance in holiday loyalty. This is a respectable result (Tabachnick and Fidell 1996). This test, in addition to the previous attempts to relate holiday attachment with HOLSAT and place attachment, points to the fact that holiday attachment fits well with the nomological network of related categories in the sphere of ideas.

Table 20.3  Reliability Analysis (Alpha) for the Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale mean if item deleted</th>
<th>Scale variance if item deleted</th>
<th>Corrected item – total correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>61.5294</td>
<td>135.6141</td>
<td>.5597</td>
<td>.8460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>61.6667</td>
<td>136.3067</td>
<td>.5138</td>
<td>.8478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>61.7843</td>
<td>140.0925</td>
<td>.3647</td>
<td>.8538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>61.7843</td>
<td>138.0125</td>
<td>.4465</td>
<td>.8505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>61.8627</td>
<td>139.4808</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.8516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>61.8824</td>
<td>134.1859</td>
<td>.5958</td>
<td>.8445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>62.0196</td>
<td>137.5796</td>
<td>.4481</td>
<td>.8504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>61.7255</td>
<td>142.0031</td>
<td>.3718</td>
<td>.8531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>61.1176</td>
<td>140.5459</td>
<td>.3965</td>
<td>.8523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>61.7843</td>
<td>136.5325</td>
<td>.6446</td>
<td>.8443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>62.1176</td>
<td>139.3059</td>
<td>.4369</td>
<td>.8508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>61.9216</td>
<td>141.6737</td>
<td>.3644</td>
<td>.8534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>62.1373</td>
<td>142.3608</td>
<td>.3608</td>
<td>.8535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>61.5882</td>
<td>135.6471</td>
<td>.5421</td>
<td>.8466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15</td>
<td>61.7255</td>
<td>142.4831</td>
<td>.3563</td>
<td>.8544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16</td>
<td>62.1373</td>
<td>133.5608</td>
<td>.5572</td>
<td>.8457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17</td>
<td>62.2549</td>
<td>137.6737</td>
<td>.4057</td>
<td>.8524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18</td>
<td>62.0980</td>
<td>143.8902</td>
<td>.3100</td>
<td>.8551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V19</td>
<td>61.9412</td>
<td>142.0965</td>
<td>.3435</td>
<td>.8542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20</td>
<td>61.6863</td>
<td>142.3396</td>
<td>.3462</td>
<td>.8540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td>61.8431</td>
<td>139.5349</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.8533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Reliability coefficients.
Number of cases = 51.0; Number of items = 21; Overall alpha value = .8570
THE HOLIDAY ATTACHMENT SCALE

Given below is the itemised list of statements constituting the holiday attachment scale, expressed in the positive language. (However, following Churchill (1979), proper balance has to be maintained between positively and negatively coined items while administering the instrument to avoid agreement response tendencies from subjects.) Responses are to be rated as SD, D, DL, AL, A and SA (SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; DL = Disagree Little; AL = Agree Little; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree).

Holiday Utility

This holiday gives me a precious opportunity to do the most likeable things in my life.
This holiday is tailored with the finest mix of activities and comforts.
I am pretty addicted to the recreation activities I do while I am on this holiday.
This holiday has the best mix of attractions that I like the most.
The food, lodging and transit provided during this holiday are first rate in general.
This holiday can be a classic case of how to manage time and resources for best results.
The itinerary designed for this holiday is utmost suitable for a person like me.
Reliable support staffs accompanying us take all the strain out of this holiday.

Holiday Identity

This holiday truthfully reflects the most lovable aspects of my self.
I take pleasure in this holiday for its own sake, not for what else it will get me.
I can confidently conclude that this holiday has got a beautiful heart and soul.
I can relate the experiences I harness out of this holiday to other aspects of my life.
This holiday is a real-life embodiment of my own vision about an ideal world.
Even if some segment of this holiday falls short of expectation, I will still be happy.
My dedicated efforts are definite, if the future continuation of this holiday calls for it.

Holiday Contextuality

My society and culture admires individuals who partake in this holiday.
The customer care programmes for this holiday extend well ahead and beyond the trip.
At this age and stage of my life, one has every reason to prefer this holiday to others.
I will get a quick and fair redress if at all any problem crops up during this holiday.

This holiday addresses my concerns about privacy and security better than any other.

I purchase this holiday because doing so will make somebody whom I love happy.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Tourist economy across the globe is fuelled by the collective behaviour rooted in subaltern symbolic and psychic structures that remain largely unexamined. How does a generic holiday package, one with no extraordinarily different consumption options, successfully defeat competition from holiday packages of other providers? Why do people spend billions of dollars to get close to something they can never possess, which very often they are not allowed to touch or to breathe on? Factors that motivate tourist desire are mysterious and elusive, even to the tourists themselves (MacCannell 2002). The present research suggests that holidaymakers as consumers face numerous influences ranging from physical and self-image factors to socioculturally conditioned factors in relationship with the objects of their ‘gaze’. And holiday attachment scale is an important key to grasp at least the moderate superficiality of these influences.

We, primarily, sought to develop a valid and reliable instrument to measure tourists’ attachment to holidays. This was, at the heart of it, an exploratory research endeavour, often guided by imperfect problem formulations and a lack of *a priori* hypotheses. The following and other leading questions emerged: What is wrong with the current approaches to measure tourists’ connectedness with holidays? Is it not possible to have more truthful constructs that can embody the antecedents of tourist loyalty to holidays than the currently available ones? What should be the nature, scope, and architecture of a holiday attachment scale that can honestly measure such a construct? At the end of the enquiry, holiday attachment scale was conceived and operationalised. A 21-item, three-dimensional scale was successfully developed to capture tourists’ attachment with holidays. It offers the potential of a valid and reliable instrument to replace the ad hoc and untested approaches that have previously been used in the field. The scale was demonstrated to have good content validity by expert judges. The stability of the scale over at least short to medium periods seemed to be satisfactory as evidenced from a retest. The criterion related validity of the scale was checked by demonstrating agreement with the order of various products as found in previous studies.

Now, we are in a position to interrogate the potential enrichment that this construct may shed upon our understanding of tourist disposition and behaviour. The researcher recognises the potential dangers involved in attempting to quantify such a thing as attachment. Also, as with any new instrument, caution should be exercised in its universal application and used as a problem solving rather than as an interpretative device. While tests of convergent and discriminant validity were performed, these tests may be criticised as just ritualistic academic
exercises, since at the present moment, no other holiday attachment measure nor measures that can confidently differentiate it has been identified in the literature. Some other issues that warrant serious discussion are, whether the sample used for the study was representative enough and what the role of response set bias was. Sears (1986) reviews the myriad problems that student dominant samples pose to generalisability, and future research works around this scale should aim to overcome these, unless serious time-resource constrictions bind them. Procedures to minimise response set bias have been detailed by many authors (Paulhus 1991; Robinson et al. 1991) and these insights must be utilised in improving upon this scale. Again, in many instances of data collection for the present scale and in negotiating a comfortable position with the respondent, the data collecting personnel had to influence the responses in some way or the other. Information loss and misrepresentation are acute limitations of an undertaking like this. Serious communication problems were to be overcome when non-English speaking tourists were interviewed. Another striking limitation of this study is that the scale used to measure tourists’ loyalty to holidays to the test of nomological validity was not previously tested for validity and reliability in the context of tourism. The present researcher just requested a few research colleagues to comment on the face validity of this scale, and it was accepted without any further scrutiny. Existing tourism-centric loyalty scales are all far lengthier; the adoption of any of these would have made the final questionnaire extremely unwieldy.

Again, in the present study, data for holiday loyalty has been collected as an intentional measure. There must be a gap between this stated behaviour and the actual behaviour. But this is an opportunity for future investigations, too. It is intuitive that this gap may be small for those who score high along the holiday identity dimension than those who score it low. A longitudinal study, preferably an experimental design, may be commissioned to look into this. If those low in holiday identity, with an overall low score of holiday attachment are found to be overstating their repurchase intention, it may mean that holiday attachment can venture itself as a more truthful measure of tourist loyalty than the presently employed measures. If holiday identity is the assured key to having truly loyal customers, further research efforts should look into the chemistry of identity development—is it biologically determined, or is it an outcome of the socio-cultural learning process.

On the contrary, if it is that each of these dimensions can be proved to be important at different stages of consumers’ holiday selection process, it must be worthwhile to explore how best can consumer engineering be done to timely highlight aspects of a holiday that correspond to each of these dimensions and hence to persuade the consumer to drift to the next stage. Or, if each of these dimensions leads straight away into holiday choice, it may be studied if similar choice patterns yield similar spatial behaviour among clusters of holidaymakers who are strong at the same dimension of attachment. What sorts of trade-offs may happen when multiple dimensions are perceived in a holiday and when each pushes the consumer to different holiday choice decisions, is also an issue worth consideration, an answer to which requires rigorous demographic and psychographic analyses. In this connection, while this study adopted a
positivistic epistemology and quantitative methodology to explore behaviour, it still did not attempt to give much reference to positive economic concepts like utility functions, indifference curve, maximisation, and so on. Although the current research broadly envisaged to combine the best aspects of humanist or cultural/sociological and economic approaches, how exactly to bring the instrumental, identity, and social-ceremonial dimensions of holiday attachment closer to the prevailing economic debates is an issue to be seriously pondered on. Economists, in general, are seen deterred from studying identity and emotions simply because people do not seem to manage their emotional life very rationally (Frijda 1986). Anyhow, this is not so simple a task; the works of socio-cultural writers like MacCannell (1976), Urry (1995) and others readily give the impression that their understanding of the holiday is fundamentally different from that of economists like Murphy (1985), Cooper et al. (1993) and others.

It has been verified that, for high novelty seekers, delight is more important than satisfaction (Oliver et al. 2001). Those who are high in novelty seeking, but attached to a holiday option due to the utility value it offers, may switch to other holidays. But, they may still restrict the scope of their choice set or latitude of acceptance among holidays that offers the same utility. Likewise, high novelty seekers who find a destination suitable for them due to high contextual semblance may not repurchase the present holiday, but again opt for one of its complementariness that fulfils the same contextual requirements. The relationships thus can possibly be non-linear and tests of non-linear interaction may be conducted to look into this aspect (Irwin and McClelland 2001). This is also a relevant theme for research.

There was an implicit assumption spread across the study that holiday attachment and tourist satisfaction are complementary constructs in certain important ways, but this relationship was not explicitly defined or explored. There is a broad consensus among researchers that as satisfaction increases so does the strength of a relationship (Thomson and Johnson 2002). This may be taken up as a future research endeavour. However, if this is attempted, it must be begun with an understanding of certain subtle differences between the two constructs, especially if satisfaction is operationalised in terms of the gap paradigm (for example, SERVQUAL) for such a study. First, holiday attachment is conceived based on an attitudinal-behavioural principle and not on disconfirmation. While reviewing literature, the researcher had noted that there is only mixed evidence that customers assess service quality and satisfaction in terms of gaps. Again, holiday attachment balances process and outcome elements of a service, whereas gap model is an unduly biased process model (Buttle 1996). Probably, strong discriminant validity may be found since holiday attachment is conceived as a more inclusive measure whereas service quality based conceptualisations of satisfaction are more about specific encounters.

While the resurgence in satisfaction research has included a movement towards more broadly constructed measures that leap far beyond the traditional cognitive approaches, examining the linkages among different approaches can be still worthwhile. If one recalls the famous two factor theory of satisfaction (Herzberg 1965), it may be felt that there is a correspondence between holiday contextuality and the hygiene factor, and holiday utility/identity
and the motivator. It may also be examined whether holiday utility and contextuality can be linked to fairly basic and middle level motivators in the Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs and holiday identity to the highest level, that is, self-actualisation. Similarly, if our dimensions can somehow be related with Swan and Combs (1976) study on instrumental and expressive dimensions of service performance, it may illuminate interesting issues. So, too, are the two important dimensions of servicescape (Bitner 1993): the spatial layout and functionality aspects, and the elements of the servicescape related to aesthetic appeal. Again, the role and script theory (Bozinoff 1982; Sutherland 1995): those who feel high holiday identity may be less service-script conscious since they are inclined to evaluate services through more qualitative criteria. There are many other constructs, too, with which similar knowledge extensions may be sought: materialism (Richins 1997), self-monitoring (Snyder 1974) and involvement (Zaichkowsky 1985), for instance. These are some of the constructs that directly came to the mind while writing this chapter, and this list is definitely not exhaustive.

Individuals with a materialistic worldview give instrumental and material possessions and their consumption a central place in life and believe them to be symbols of success and important sources of satisfaction. Visibly consumable artifacts having public meanings are valued more by more materialistic persons, due to the potential of such products to impress. Materialism has, thus, a good chance to semantically correlate with the holiday utility and contextuality dimensions. Self-monitoring is another relevant construct because high self-monitors are fashionable, prestige conscious and behave as per situational cues, whereas low self-monitors are those who behave according to the demands of their inner voice. At the outset, high self-monitoring seems to have some association with holiday contextuality and low with holiday identity. It may be recalled that some potential linkages of holiday attachment with the involvement construct has been explored at the scale development stage.

Numerous investigations are reported in the literature that looks into aspects of customer involvement in tourism (Havitz and Dimanche 1999; Broderic and Mueller 1999; Celsi and Olson 1988), and it would be valuable to see if different aspects of holiday attachment could produce complementary results. Following the example of Fornell (1992) a number of national customer satisfaction measures have been developed. Along similar lines, future researchers can extend the scope of the present work by examining how the model flexes itself across cultures. A good beginning will be to study it with respect to the country and culture dimensions of Hofstede (1980). Holidaymakers from masculinist cultures might be seeking for the fulfilment of more functional and utility-based values from their holiday and those from feminist cultures might be seeking more qualitative experiences. Those from collective cultures might warily search if a holiday meets the much required societal approval.

Also, the potential linkages holiday attachment has with the attribution theory literature. Those who have intense holiday identity may not attribute the cause of any service failure to others. In fact, one of the item-statements that constitutes the holiday identity dimension itself is, ‘I will still be happy even if some component of this holiday fails to deliver.’ The researcher is acutely aware that specifying future directions is one matter and pursuing them is another.
The latter requires, as a prerequisite, the evolution of capable multi-disciplinary methodologies since most of the aforesaid issues cannot be addressed within the boundaries of any single discipline.

Given this much, nobody should be stubborn that the outcome of a research like this be explicable within the bosom of the study itself, since the meaning of any theoretical construct is set forth by stating the laws of nature in which they occur, our knowledge about which itself is partial and ill-formed, thus producing vagueness in the meaning of these constructs. Learning more about a theoretical construct is a matter of elaborating the nomological network in which it is situated. When a construct is fairly nascent, there may be few specific associations by which to pin it down, but as research proceeds, the construct sends out roots in many directions, which attach it to more and more facts or to other constructs. To the knowledge of the researcher, this is the first study that has conceptualised holiday attachment as a consumer behaviour construct, operationalised it as a three-dimensional scale and established it as an important antecedent of tourist loyalty. In this process, the holiday attachment got its positioning in the network of related category of ideas and through them the much required legitimacy. The present study uncovers and quantifies the underlying dimensions of tourists’ attachment towards holidays as functional, experiential and situational associations, which is a scheme that has found acceptance in measuring related concepts like consumer involvement, customer satisfaction, place attachment, and so on. For the record, even while experiential associations were investigated previously, the focus was predominantly upon the affective aspects of advertising while tending to neglect the equally important feelings associated with the consumption experiences themselves (Holbrook 1995). In this regard, the advent of the holiday identity construct in the present study may be viewed as a point of departure.

Almost all of the conventional literature stresses that tourism involves temporary trips from a permanent place of residence to some other place where the tourist stays for a short period and enjoys good recreational time. Besides, such literature gives a highly circumscribed definition for a destination and its attractions, and terms all the rest of the things contributing to tourism as necessary evils. A few works do visualise tourist experiences within a broader canvas, but most of them suffer from the faulty epistemology of atomism. In stark contrast, the present work is justly holistic not in the least because it does not presume that overall holiday attachment is the additive total of attachment with the different spatio temporal components that make up the holiday. And, tourism analysis is one area that is definitely going to be enriched.

The ultimate test of the scale, as any other measurement apparatus, is whether or not it can be used in empirical studies to examine various aspects and implications of the construct it purports to measure (Zaichkowsky 1985). However, it is only when a critical mass of research work uses the instrument that any generalisable norm can evolve. Perhaps some day, there will dawn a more comprehensive understanding of the role of attachment in consumption behaviour. I would like to conclude this chapter by noting that while there may never be a perfect scale, a cache of research on scales and scale development will still generate a knowledge base that
may be useful in understanding the subtle commonalities underlying many disparate and disconnected immediacies, and it is up to the community of discerning critics to decide if the holiday attachment scale suits this description.

**APPENDIX**

**Initial Items Generated**

1. At my age and stage of life, one has every reason to prefer this holiday to others.
2. Even if some segment of this holiday fails to meet my expectations, I will still be happy.
3. Friendly and experienced local guides help me to get the most out of this holiday.
4. I am habituated to this holiday and because of that I purchase it as a ritual now.
5. I am in high spirits about making my choice in favour of this holiday.
6. I am in the mood of a family reunion and this holiday offers best ambience for that.
7. My dedicated efforts are always there if the prolongation of this holiday calls for it.
8. I am sure to get a fair redress, if, at all, any problem arises during this holiday.
9. I am very sentimental about this holiday.
10. I buy this holiday because it will make somebody whom I love happy.
11. I buy this holiday because my spouse/children/parents/friends, etc., love it very much.
12. I buy this holiday owing to the quick availability of all the information that I want.
13. I can confidently conclude that this holiday has a beautiful heart and soul.
14. I relate the experiences I harness out of this holiday to other aspects of my life.
15. I cannot imagine a better holiday for what I like to do.
16. I cannot imagine a world of mine in its perfection, leaving aside this holiday.
17. I enjoy discussing about this holiday with everyone.
18. I enjoy this holiday for its own sake, not for what it will get me.
19. I favour this holiday because it is really affordable.
20. I feel I am exploring new worlds each time I participate in this holiday.
21. I feel like this holiday brings me closer to what I want to be.
22. I get more fulfillment out of partaking in this holiday than partaking in any other.
23. I love this holiday because a lot of care is given for my health and hygienic needs.
24. I must say that I am pretty addicted to the recreation activities I do while on this holiday.
25. I must say that I identify myself strongly with this holiday.
26. I would have bought this holiday more frequently if I could somehow manage it.
27. I would have happily spent much more time here if I could somehow manage it.
28. I would not prefer any other holiday for doing the types of things I do now.
29. It is my honeymoon and this holiday suits best for that.
30. My society and culture respects individuals who partake in this holiday.
31. No other holiday can compare to this holiday.
32. One can tell a lot about persons from whether they purchase this holiday or not.
33. One reason why I opt for this holiday is because it is so hassle free to do bookings.
34. Partaking this holiday is a bit like giving a gift to oneself.
35. Participating in this holiday helps me attain the life that I strive for.
36. Participating in this holiday, makes me feel that the ideal world of my dreams has come closer to reality.
Reliable support staffs accompanying tourists take all the strain out of this holiday.
The accommodation facilities provided throughout this holiday meet my needs fully.
The duration allotted for each component of this holiday is optimum.
The evening entertainments being organised as part of this holiday are fantastic.
The food choices set for me throughout this holiday are the best of its kind.
The itinerary designed for this holiday is the best balanced one I can ever think of.
The post-visit customer relationship programmes for this holiday are admirable.
The time I spent on this holiday could not have been spent as fruitfully anywhere else.
The transit services provided for me throughout this holiday are first rate.
There is a definite preference for this holiday in the society to which I aspire to belong.
This holiday best suits my current job and status in my society.
You cannot have a better bargain for this price, I must tell you.
This holiday evokes memories of my most cherished past.
This holiday gives me ample opportunities to interact with the locals in real-life settings.
This holiday gives me a precious opportunity to do the most likeable things in my life.
This holiday gives me opportunity to serve for the upliftment of the destination community.
This holiday has the best mix of attractions that I like the most.
This holiday is a real life embodiment of my own ideas about how to organise holidays.
This holiday is a storehouse of educational opportunities.
This holiday is a unique opportunity for me to show others who I am deep inside.
This holiday is tailored with an ideal balance between activities and comforts.
This holiday can be a classic case of how to manage time and resources for best results.
This holiday means a lot to me.
This holiday truly reflects the most lovable aspects of my self.
This holiday offers me a lot of scope for personalisation in the itinerary.
This holiday offers me a unique chance to shop for stuffs not available in my country.
This holiday positively exceeds every expectation one may have about a holiday.
This holiday provides me sexual opportunities not available in my home society.
This holiday respects my need for privacy.
This holiday speaks about who I am more than anything else.
This holiday takes care of my entire security needs utmost well.
This holiday tells a lot about my lifestyle.
This holiday gives me the best opportunity for what I like to do on a typical holiday.
Those who accompany me on this holiday like it and hence, I like it too.
What I do while I am on this holiday I cannot do any other time with as much delight.
When I am at this holiday, others see me the way I really want them to see me.
Whenever I feel like purchasing a holiday, my first preference goes to this one.
While at this holiday, I experience a total escape from the chores of mundane life.
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SECTION-E
CHANGING HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES
The Professionalisation of Tourism

Preparing the way for the portfolio careerist in Australia

KEVIN D. LYONS

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is on the cutting edge of the services focussed industries that have emerged in post-industrial contexts. Recent research suggests that this growth in tourism and related labour demand has not been adequately served by supply and has resulted in a labour shortage across the gamut of jobs in the industry from unskilled, through semi-skilled to senior executive positions (Hjalager and Andersen 2001). Unskilled workers have always been the mainstay of the tourism labour market, especially in developing countries (Vanhove 2005). However, while unskilled positions will remain, the demand for such workers will be eclipsed by the need for professional personnel, who can lead the industry in the future (Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources 2002). This trend towards a demand for skilled and credentialled workers has been widely recognised as a key indicator that the tourism labour market is undergoing a process of professionalisation (Gee 1997; Hjalager and Andersen 2001). Gee (1997) has commented that this is especially true in fast growing destinations in the Asia-Pacific region. Currently, countries, such as Australia, that have relatively well-developed tourism training and education systems are increasingly attractive to neighbouring countries who seek skilled expatriates to fill professional positions.

In Australia, tourism is broadly acknowledged as an industry that is central to job creation (Dredge and Jenkins 2007). It has been estimated that in Australia, tourism accounts for 5.7 per cent of total employment (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2004). Some estimates suggest that tourism employment in Australia during the period 1995–2000 grew at almost twice the rate of total employment in the country (Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources 2002). Although there has been a decline in tourism employment figures since the late 1990s, the tourism industry is still considered a significant player in the Australian economy — assuming there is agreement about what constitutes the industry. Vanhove (2005) argues that the tourism industry is often unproblematically referred to by politicians, media and others as a discrete entity. However, the reality is that a great deal of slippage between related industries, such as
hospitality, recreation and leisure industries more broadly, often muddy the waters. Analysis of this labour market and the occupations that comprise it, inevitably requires casting arbitrary nets around it. This process results in uneven understandings of what are the labour growth prospects for the industry (Leiper 1999).

While the tourism labour market may not live up to some claims, there is an enduring belief among those graduating from vocational training institutions and universities that the tourism industry holds promise of valuable career opportunities. However, there is a gulf between the broad employment promises of the tourism industry and the realities of developing such careers. Professional career prospects in tourism are presented as a clear and unambiguous pathway available to those interested. But the reality is far more complex. For those seeking out a professional career in the industry, it is not simply a matter of walking out of university and stepping onto a career path that is stable and clear. In fact, there seems to be a major disconnect between these enthusiastic future tourism professionals and the realities of a career in the tourism industry. While there is some research to the contrary (Choy 1995), most studies concur that skilled professional tourism workers become disillusioned with their jobs because of, ‘... a mismatch between the expectations ... and the actual realities of the job’ (Dewar et al. 2002: 12). Some estimates for job dissatisfaction in the tourism industry are as high as 80 to 90 per cent (Vecchio et al. 1996).

Unlike other sectors and professions, the successful ‘tourism professional’ if indeed there is such a person, is faced with a volatile labour context where careers rarely follow traditional predictable patterns, and these individuals will need skills and knowledge to be able to strategically negotiate this volatile work context (Lyons and Brown 2003). The individual who succeeds in this setting must develop the ability to carve out, what has been termed a ‘portfolio career’ (Handy 1996), from within a labour environment that is dominated by an increasingly mobile, casualised and part-time workforce, largely driven by small to medium business enterprises. However, tourism education has largely ignored this type of career and the skills that are needed to be successful in the tourism industry. This chapter examines the rise of the portfolio careerist in the tourism industry, the implications of this type of career for the industry and new challenges to tourism education that need to be considered to ensure that professionalisation in the tourism industry continues.

THE TOURISM INDUSTRY AND PORTFOLIO CAREERS

A professional career in tourism is enticing to many, who have heard the claims being echoed by a range of stakeholders that the tourism industry is growing fast and creating a multitude of career opportunities to those willing to become suitably qualified. Indeed, tourism is considered as an important player in the global economy and has been cited as a major contributor to employment growth worldwide (UNWTO 2005). According to a recent report by the Australian Government (2004), the tourism workforce in Australia patterns global trends toward a highly mobile labour force. A study of on the career progress of tourism graduates
found that fewer than 40 per cent of tourism graduates surveyed were working in the tourism industry (McKercher et al. 1995). This pattern of mobility of staff was once limited to those with relatively low levels of formal qualifications. However, as the workforce professionalises, this mobility is being replicated even among the most highly credentialed workers in the industry. Some have suggested that high turnover among the professional workers can be attributed to the relatively low pay levels relative to level of education and the poor working hours (Riley et al. 2002). Others have suggested that these workers are often over qualified and seek new challenges that will enable them to learn and grow (Purcell and Quinn 1996). The result is a highly mobile tourism labour force. As Brown (2002: 1–2) suggests:

By choice or necessity it’s only natural to be restless in an era with new talent markets encouraging job and career mobility and so many organisations treating employees like just in time inventory . . . now there is a restless and credentialed cohort . . . who consider life too short to wait for the promise of a gold watch. These are individual-centred prospectors, not organisation centred loyalists, looking for their own special gold that they have promised themselves and find worth pursuing from one organisation to another.

Loyalty to a particular employer is becoming a thing of the past and although some research shows that employee commitment and loyalty may still exist, it does so only as a marketable form where employee loyalty is seen as part of a package, ‘. . . put on the labour market and sold to their employer’ (Martin et al. 2000: 344). While some larger organisations seek to minimise this turnover by creating internal career paths that provide opportunities for advancement within a particular organisation (Martin et al. 2000), this is a costly process that requires the development of training pathways and a large organisational structure that provides for vertical movement.

In a recent study of students enrolled for a Tourism Management degree programme, respondents indicated they were attracted to jobs in large organisations (Hjalager 2003), where traditional career opportunities still exist through promotion and advancement within a corporation. However, the reality is that careers in the tourism industry are characterised by high mobility. In part, this is because of the dominance of small and medium sized businesses that constitute approximately 50 per cent of the total workforce in tourism (Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources 2002). In Australia, for example, approximately 80 to 90 per cent of tourism operations are small businesses, defined as those businesses with less than 20 employees (Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources 2002: 2). These small businesses offer little opportunity for vertical or lateral career development.

**THE RISE OF THE PORTFOLIO CAREER-BASED TOURISM PROFESSIONAL**

The trend towards career mobility is particularly evident in highly dynamic and changeable new service industries that have emerged over the past two decades, such as tourism
This context of change is suited to the development of portfolio careers, as career pathways are not necessarily contingent upon the success of a specific organisation or profession. A portfolio career is strategically crafted by individuals and is based on their perception of the capabilities and attributes they possess in relation to work opportunities. Portfolio careerists, ‘seek strategic job moves and developmental experiences to compile marketable and refreshed skill profiles which keep pace with the rapid changes in roles and job demands’ (Jackson et al. 1996: 26).

In a study on career aspirations of tourism workers it was found that workers recognised advancement to management positions was not dependent upon promotion through operational levels but was more dependent upon having appropriate business acumen either on the job or through education (Deery 2000). But what should this education look like? To answer this question first requires determining what comprises a tourism professional. There is general agreement that tourism is undergoing a process of professionalisation (Hjalager 2003). However, if using strict definitions of ‘profession’ the notion of professionalisation of the tourism workforce is potentially a misnomer. While the process of professionalisation is hailed as an indicator of industry maturity—a sort of coming of age (Jackson 1970)—the professionalisation of tourism is quite different to traditional definitions.

The term ‘professional’ can be defined in a number of ways but most definitions treat profession and professional synonymously. Chelladurai (1999) narrowly defines a profession around a discrete occupation that has a systematic body of knowledge, professional authority, is sanctioned by the community and follows a regulative code of ethics. Using this as a definition it is not really possible to identify a tourism profession or professional, although, some may argue that specific occupations that are primarily tourism-based, such as tour guiding (Ap and Wong 2001) and others might to some degree fit this definition. Yet many are not and are difficult to claim as a tourism-specific profession.

Others have suggested a process model that defines an occupation as a profession, where the service provided by the occupation is measured on a continuum of the essentiality of the service in relation to some universal social concern or problem (Jackson 1970), has exclusive claim to knowledge and competencies necessary to provide a service, and is complex and includes the development of a range of skills that can be collectively applied to solve a problem or provide a service. Once again, in the tourism industry there are a range of occupations that may, to some degree, fit this definition. Positions, such as hotel managers, tourism managers in local government areas and others have an air of professionalism but are more likely to be semi-professional, where some of the characteristics of a profession are apparent but not all (Forsyth and Danisiewicz 1985). Based on this definition, the professionalisation of the tourism industry is uneven and incomplete.

The traditional notion of career and the traditional definition of ‘profession’ work well together. However, in industries such as tourism, whose labour market is highly mobile—professional is a far more loosely defined term. Emergent tourism professionalisation is far
less tied to a professional body of knowledge that is narrowly defined. As Hjalager and Andersen (2001: 120) have noted, ‘the industry is increasingly employing persons with any educational background, not just a dedicated one’. Rather it seems tourism professionals are better served by highly transferable knowledge that they can take with them across an industry and even beyond. Ethics and standards are dictated not by an accrediting body but by a personal moral standard that is and of itself perceived by the industry as a skill. Recognition of a community sanctioning of such a profession is implicit in the support such professionalised status receives from World Trade Organization (WTO) and other tourism organisations. The essentiality of a service is determined less by direct means but through the broader macro measure of economic growth, arguably, an essential criterion for national prosperity. The tourism professional is freed from the binds of traditional career paths or narrow definitions of a profession, and this gives them the freedom to pursue careers across boundaries. However, how is such a professional best prepared and educated for this very fluid labour environment?

**Preparing the Tourism Professional**

One of the major debates regarding the preparation of tourism professionals focusses upon what sort of knowledge and skills that are deemed necessary and appropriate for these workers. To help structure this discussion, a broad framework is used that categorises skills as technical, conceptual and human skills (Edginton et al. 1992). Technical skills are typically industry or even organisation specific. Conceptual and human skills include those skills sometimes referred to as core, generic or transferable skills (Butler 1989; Evers et al. 1998; Waterman 1991) that are more mobile and are becoming increasingly important for more senior positions.

Technical skills have been the traditional focus of tourism and particularly hospitality training (Sigala and Baum 2003), where the practical craft-based training necessary for jobs, such as chefs, coach drivers, and guides and also more socio-emotional skills related to the delivery of quality customer service, are developed. Debates over whether tourism education should be narrowly focussed upon these industry skills or whether they should cast the net more broadly is ongoing (McKercher 2002). Nevertheless, the technical, industry skills are still seen as necessary from the perspective of employers, but some believe that these skills can be readily developed through the vocational education and training (VET) sector. In Australia, VET providers are increasingly improving their products directly in line with the demands of the industry. This link is well supported by the National Training Framework supported by the Australian government and driven by training focussed entities, such as Tourism Training, Australia.

Universities have also staked a claim to vocational preparation and the development of industry skills. Browse through marketing literature produced by universities that offer tourism related courses and programmes and you are likely to find claims of vocational relevancy and to professional careers in tourism. This is evident in the following extracts taken from
promotional material from universities with prominent undergraduate programmes in tourism focused studies in Australia:

- This degree major provides the relevant knowledge and skills required for career advancement and management positions in the rapidly expanding tourism industry in Australia and overseas (Curtin University 2005: 1).
- This course provides students with the knowledge and professional skills necessary to operate within the tourism industry (University of Technology, Sydney 2005: 1).
- This degree provides students with the knowledge and skills for professional careers in recreation and tourism industries (University of Newcastle 2005: 1).
- This degree course prepares professional leisure service managers for potential careers in service delivery and management in the recreation, sport and tourism industries (Griffith University 2005: 1).

Indeed, over the past 30 years a large growth in university-based tourism programmes around the globe focused upon the skills and knowledge that serve particular niche markets, such as degree programmes in international tourism, tourism economics, ecotourism or wine tourism. These programmes were clearly linked to trends within the industry and were seen to be serving the needs of particular growth sectors and ensure quality in these areas (Thwaites et al. 2002). A recent review of tourism-related degree programmes offered in the United Kingdom found that the general focus of these programmes was strongly vocational (Busby and Fiedel 2001). However, this approach has led to highly specialised programmes that lack the transferability needed in contemporary work environments (Handy 1996).

In a study of university tourism programmes in Korea, it was found that there is a gulf between what educators deem to be essential in the curricula in comparison to the tourism industry respondents. The study found that there was strong negative relationship between educators and tourism professionals surveyed. That is, educators were more satisfied with programmes that had strong emphasis upon specific skills and graduates were more satisfied with programmes that emphasised the transferable skills, which they felt gave them mobility. The author noted that this gap clearly needs to be addressed (Yoon 1996).

Australian universities which offer tourism-related courses, like their counterparts around the world, developed their offerings in response to the growth in tourism and in consultation with industry and stakeholder representatives to ensure that regional industry needs were met. In countries such as Australia many of the tourism programmes taught at universities developed from polytechnic systems (McKercher 2002). In Australia from the late 1970s, programmes began developing fairly rapidly and grew during the late 1980s from 13 to 16 (Craig-Smith et al. 1995). Recent estimates suggest there are approximately 27 universities in Australia offering tourism or hospitality-related programmes (McKercher 2002). The rapid growth in tourism education at the university level has been attributed in part to Australian Commonwealth policy that
recognised the need for developing a skilled tourism labour force, as a result, specialist degrees in tourism began emerging in universities across the country (McKercher 2002).

Some of the research suggests that while these ‘industry’ skills are necessary, it is the conceptual and human skills that are lacking and need to be addressed. Recognising the stiff competition that the VET sector presents for the development of industry-related technical skills, universities in Australia have leaped onto the ‘transferable skills’ bandwagon and now emphasise the core capabilities that they develop in their graduates. Indeed, these core skills are highly sought after in the tourism industry. Communication, problem solving, listening, negotiating, teamwork, literacy and numeracy skills are considered to be in short supply among employees in the tourism, not only at lower level positions but also among middle and upper professional positions (Saibang and Schwint 1998). These are the skills that are most transferable and are likely to serve the highly mobile nature of a portfolio careerist.

It has been suggested that tourism education needs to adapt to industry trends towards globalised activities and shift from, ‘locally valid qualifications to modes of study which can be accessed anywhere and which are valid everywhere’ (Sigala and Baum 2003: 374). At a recent tourism career fair held at a US university campus, a former Ambassador and representative of the State Department was quoted as stating: ‘Management is management’ (Guzman 2004: 2), implying that tourism-related skills that are highly transferable are not the property of tourism focussed degree programmes alone.

It seems, tourism education in Australian universities may become victim of their own desire to be all, ‘all thing to all people’. In the climate of rationalisation that is starting to dominate Australian universities (McKercher 2002), there is a question as to whether these degrees are sustainable. Indeed, McKercher (2002) has argued that university-based tourism education is in decline stage of its lifecycle. University-based programmes are caught in a no-win situation, where, if the programmes they offer replicate the vocational offerings of the VET sector they will be deemed uncompetitive and poor imitations of a highly developed nationally recognised training system. If they emphasise the transferable core skills that appeal to the portfolio careerist, they will appear too similar to more generalist degree programmes that are highly transferable, such as business related degree programmes. Ultimately, it is likely that the preparation of the tourism industry professional will be largely a blend of VET offerings and generalist degree programmes. Indeed, the Australian government’s recently released policy paper on strategic directions for Tourism in Australia recognised that tourism education and training seem to be pulling each other from different directions: ‘The formal education options available within the tourism industry are widely varied and fragmented. There is a large number of agencies providing courses at many different levels . . .’. In this report the Australian government’s (2004: 27) solution to this fragmentation is to improve articulation arrangements between the various training and education providers.

Providing a balance between industry specific skills and broader highly transferable skills in tourism education is a major challenge (King et al. 2003). The blurring between the tertiary
sectors (Australian National Training Authority 2003) creates some ambiguities that are difficult to manage not only from the perspective of a young professional but also from the perspective of policy maker and industry stakeholders.

THE FUTURE OF THE TOURISM PROFESSIONAL

Professionalisation of the tourism industry has developed rapidly. In the process, the notion of professionalism in this industry is questioned—what it is and what are the implications for tourism education are. Some have suggested that a New Tourism education paradigm is necessary that will accommodate the tenuous career options available to professional workers, and that focusses upon a generalist approach to skills (Hjalager 2003). Part of the challenge in moving in this new direction can be explained using Kuhnian notion of normal science (Kuhn 1970), which suggests that what may have once been considered a paradigm shift toward tourism education as a field worthy of university level education is now subsumed into the normal science of management and business that continues to have a stronghold in the professional preparation of workers.

The portfolio careerist is still in the process of emerging in the tourism industry. Many graduates are only now realising the unstable career path they are walking. However, as these workers develop the skills and confidence necessary to pursue portfolio careers, the tourism industry will face even greater levels of labour turnover and mobility.

Clearly a more strategic and united approach to preparing for the portfolio careerist is needed.
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The Good Guide

Identifying and engendering generic skills in the training of tourist guides

MICHAEL F. CHRISTIE AND PETER MASON

INTRODUCTION

In the recent novel by John le Carré, *Absolute Friends* (2003), the main protagonist, Ted Mundy, is an Oxford graduate who has worked for many years for the British Intelligence. As a cover for his spying, he arranges cultural events for the British Council. After the Cold War, he is forced out of spying and lives in Germany. With a pay-off from the secret service and his degree from Oxford he sets up an English language school in Heidelberg. Language teaching in a foreign country, like tour guiding, is one of those professions where one can still be employed without proper qualifications. When Ted Mundy’s venture fails, more because of a dodgy business partner than his lack of teaching skills, he takes up a job as a tourist guide in a Bavarian castle. Although he was trained for neither of the jobs, Ted Mundy is an adequate language teacher and quite a good tourist guide. It is not often that the main character of a novel is a tour guide but it is significant that when one is, he happens to have no formal training. There are still many tourist guides around the world who work without any formal qualification. They might use a spiel prepared for them by their employer or learn from a guide book. Perhaps like Ted Mundy they develop knowledge and guiding skills on the job. In this respect they are not so different from others who make a living from tourism—tour operators, waiters, drivers, hoteliers, and so on. It can be argued that it would be better for an industry that is rapidly becoming one of the most important in the world, if those who work in it are trained. The authors believe that this is especially important for tour guides who interpret sites for visitors from mixed cultures and backgrounds. The more sensitive those sites become and the more complex the guided experience is, the more imperative it is that those who describe them are professionally trained and capable of acting as agents for sustainable tourism. We are not alone in this belief (Ang 1990; Holloway 1981; Howard 1997; Moscardo 1996, Mowforth and Munt 1997; Orams 1995; Pond 1993).
Vocational Education and Training

In the last 20 years many western countries have recognised that tourism, along with other industries, requires a trained workforce whose credentials are recognised nationally and internationally. Apprenticeships in various trades and vocations have been replaced by a combination of on-the-job training and college-based courses. In the late 1980s, the Australian government embraced a new form of vocational education called competency based training (CBT) and invested huge amounts of money in creating a national agency to implement it. Australia’s national training authority (hereafter ANTA) enacted regulations to control and synchronise curricula and the accreditation of vocational qualifications including certificates, diplomas and degrees in tourism education (Chappell et al. 1995; Gonzi 1992). The system relied on regular skills audits of the various trades and occupations in order to create up-to-date and relevant curricula. Learning outcomes were specified in behavioural terms and as long as students could demonstrate that they were competent (could do what the job requires) they were awarded a national trade certificate.

The system was designed to avoid lock-step education in which talented students were required to keep pace with slower ones even if they could demonstrate that they had already become competent in a skill or a subject. The CBT students who had acquired skills and competencies, and could prove it via competency based assessments, could move on to the next module without having to wait for the rest of the class. Trained assessors in each vocational area were used to maintain quality standards and certify people, no matter where or how long they took to develop the desired competence. Another feature of the system was that people who were already doing a good job (tour guides, for example, who had interpreted a particular site or city for many years) could have their knowledge and skills recognised by submitting a portfolio and being observed at their work. Recognition of prior learning, or RPL as it is known, saved government, industry and individuals a lot of time and money, and helped regulate standards and conditions within rapidly growing industries such as tourism.

Today, in Australia, there is a nationally accredited course for tour guides called Certificate Two in Tour Guiding. Vocational Education and Training (VET) providers use national modules as the basis for their own customised courses. The Certificate in Tour Guiding has many advantages—it offers prospective tour guides a modularised course that can be undertaken in stages, a nationally accredited award on completion and much lower fees than apply in higher education. VET programmes work particularly well for training people in practical skills. Tourist guides in Australia, for example, are expected to complete a module in health and safety, including elementary first aid. Such a skill can be tested as students complete the module and keep a record of their result. Even if students cannot finish the whole course, their records will show that they have passed particular modules and they only need to demonstrate their competency if at a later date they decide to resume their studies. This is one of the strengths of competency-based training (Gonzi 1992). While this system works well with skills-based
programmes, the authors have argued previously that tourist guides are more like teachers than tradespeople, and the sort of specific and generic skills they learn should reflect this (Mason and Christie 2003). Communication skills are important for all vocations but clearly more important for those vocations where facilitating the understanding and knowledge of others is at the heart of the activity.

Many other countries, the UK, New Zealand (NZ), Canada and the USA, for example, have begun to implement similar systems of vocational education and training. In regard to tour guide training, NZ comes closest to Australia, with the UK a close third. Since tour guiding has such a long tradition in the UK, guides have been able to obtain the coveted ‘Blue Badge’, a system of accreditation that pre-dates the vocational education system now in place. Today the UK requires guides to attend courses, complete coursework and take exams that account for up to 28 weeks or 320 hours of study before they acquire the equivalent of the ‘Blue Badge’. In the USA, some cities, such as New York, have also had a tradition of licensing their guides after determining that they are of good health, have no criminal record and can pass a multiple choice exam on the sites they are expected to interpret. Guides can renew their licence annually by paying a small fee (Pond 1993). In European cities, like Vienna, a similar system has been in place for a long time. Prospective guides must supply a health certificate, prove competency in two languages and pass an exam related to their knowledge of the city. Today, both in Europe and the USA, there are also hundreds of universities and colleges that offer degrees in tourism albeit with an emphasis on business management and communication skills (Knudson et al. 1995; quoted in Mason and Christie 2003). In Canada there is now a National Tourism Human Resource Council (CTHRC) that can help experienced but untrained guides who wish to obtain professional certification http://www.trainingvillage.gr/etv/default.asp). The council provides an ‘Industry Evaluation’ which includes a multiple-choice written examination and a practical, on-the-job performance assessment.

From its inception, the CBT movement in Australia was concerned with generic as well as specific skills. A set of generic skills were worked out for all forms of vocational education. There was a great deal of debate about how generic skills could be implemented and assessed. The competency called ‘cross-cultural awareness’ was a good example of this. In tour guiding, it was not inconceivable for students with strong anti-aboriginal feelings to mouth the right sentiments or even act them out in supervised settings but then reveal their true colours once they had graduated and were interpreting sites on their own. Perhaps because teaching such skills was hard, many lecturers focussed on the practical skills of each trade or vocation. They were certainly easier to define, implement and assess. We suspect that this has led to an overemphasis on practical skills and a neglect of those qualities that are more difficult to measure. In tourism, for example, it is easier to teach safety procedures and background knowledge about sites than the capacity for critical, analytical thought or the ability to communicate in gender sensitive situations. In many cases the distinction between specific and generic skills becomes blurred. Even the language we use to describe such skills can be confusing. Before proceeding we should
clarify the three terms we use interchangeably in this chapter, namely skills, capabilities and competencies. Of the three words, ‘skill’ is probably the simplest to use and understand. It means knowing how to do something. The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as, ‘expertness, practised ability, facility in an action or in doing something’. The terms ‘capability’ and ‘competence’ are more complicated. Originally ‘capability’ meant ‘an underdeveloped faculty or property’. The eighteenth century English landscape gardener, Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown got his nickname because of his habit of looking at land he was asked to landscape and saying, ‘it has capabilities’ (The Shorter English Dictionary: 382). However, Brown was also capable in the modern sense of the word. He had ‘the power, ability, competence and talent to do something’. Brown combined specific knowledge and practical skills in his chosen profession with more general talents: the ability to see the big picture, to communicate with his clients, to motivate his workers, and to combine economics and aesthetics. No matter what terms we choose, there has been in recent years much more focus on developing generic as well as specific skills in students undertaking courses at universities and colleges. Unfortunately, the terms are often used loosely and in different contexts. In this chapter, the authors intend to specify some of the specific and generic competencies that a good guide needs, and suggest some ways of teaching and assessing them.

Methodology

In order to identify the qualities of a good guide, we interviewed a number of students enrolled in a tour guide course in the tourist town of Vadstena in Sweden. Our sample was small (25 students) but the process was seen as a pilot for a larger survey. The students were selected because they made up the final year of a vocational course in tourism, and had a lot of experience of and exposure to professional guides in a number of different settings and countries. We have used the first names of the students only in order to acknowledge their contribution and to maintain anonymity. Our method was to simply ask the students to write about a tourist guide they admired. They did this prior to a workshop where they sat in small groups and discussed the qualities of the guides they had written about. The group was asked to reach a consensus on what they thought were the three most important qualities displayed by the guides they chose. In addition to this process, we used participant observation, a method borrowed from ethnographical research where the researcher is immersed in the experience but keeps a logbook in which observations, conversations and other data are recorded. One of the authors (Michael Christie) travelled with a group of students from Vadstena that did not involve any of those who took part in the survey mentioned above. These students were chosen because they were older and many of them had returned to study to upgrade their qualifications or to build on experience that they already had in the tourism industry. This field trip consisted of journeying by train and bus to the north of Sweden (as far as the border) and visiting sites along the way. The focus of the trip was the area in and around the mining town of Kiruna.
During the tour, the students, in pairs, were asked to interpret sites they had studied as well as attended tours, where professional guides were in charge. The discussions we observed, took place immediately after each interpretation of a site or when that was not possible, in the evening at a group meeting. The discussions were led by the two teachers who accompanied the students and focussed on the qualities of a good guide and on interesting aspects of the interpretation. On one occasion, a professional guide took the group a kilometre underground to see a working iron ore mine. The iron mine experience was subsequently compared with three other mining tours, one in a former coal mine on the border of Holland and Belgium, one in a disused gold mine at Sovereign Hill in Victoria, Australia and one in a small abandoned iron mine outside Örebro in Sweden.

Study Results

What is interesting to report is that the resulting list of qualities that we identified with the good guide, is the one that most lay people would intuitively agree with. We have mentioned some of these qualities above but the key qualities identified in our survey are—a deep knowledge of the site and good communication skills. The discussions, observed during the trip north and the responses from student tourist guides in Vadstena, allowed us to fine tune these two fundamental qualities. Knowledge is the bedrock of any interpretation but how it is presented is also crucial. The students responded most positively to guides that could use their knowledge in versatile ways. For example, a guide at Universeum (a natural science museum in Gothenburg, Sweden), was able to interpret the animal and other exhibits in an informative and interesting way to a number of different groups, ranging from small children and rowdy schoolboys to adults and serious science students. He did this by adapting to the group. He literally got down to the level of the small children by sitting on the floor as he talked. With the rowdy boys he used psychology, and gave responsible and prestigious tasks to the most likely ringleader of schoolboy mischief. One of our informants, Elin, said of this guide: ‘Klas was not only an inspiring guide; he also did his best to make sure that everyone in the group enjoyed themselves. If he noticed someone in the group was quieter or shyer, he sensitively drew them out a little. It was a good way of underlining that one doesn’t just listen to the noisiest in the group.’ The main reason she thought Klas was a good guide, however, was his pedagogical skills: ‘The main reason Klas is the guide I want to write about is because he didn’t just teach or preach (like a lot of guides I have experienced) but rather he inspired the group to ask questions and discuss the exhibits. In other words he allowed everyone to take part in the guided experience.’ Other students, too, wrote about this guide and a common theme was that he was not just a good guide but also a delightful person. Which raises an old, much debated question: are teachers and guides born or made (Dewey 1916, 1933; Woods 1996)?

In the responses we received, there was a great deal of variation on the theme of good communication. In a number of descriptions, students spoke about guides like Monica, who could
speak at least three languages fluently. Others talked about how guides obtained and held attention. Monica, for example, employed tactics similar to Ted Mundy in *Absolute Friends*, who wore a bowler hat, carried a soap box to gain height and drew people into a tight circle around him, so he could be heard. In her case, Monica had a blue cap and insisted her group came near enough to hear her comfortably. How do we summarise such pedagogical qualities? Surely they are common sense, but is the acquisition of them a science or an art (Woods 1996). Jessica spoke of a guide who interpreted a cloister church, a subject she had no interest in at all. And yet, by dint of the guide's erudition, and a pleasant and varied speaking voice, Jessica was enthralled. In another insight into pedagogical issues, Jessica pointed out that the guide restricted himself to those things he really knew about. In a couple of other responses, the students touched on the issue of credibility. Jonathan experienced a guided tour of a theme park by the director of the park. He was impressed both by the man's wide knowledge and his use of educational technology (a slide show) to enrich the experience. Jonathan also spoke about another quality that reappeared often in the student descriptions, namely, enthusiasm for the subject and site. One aspect of good communication that re-occurred in the student descriptions, was the use of humour to maintain interest. A student wrote about Annette, a guide in her sixties, who was in charge of a bus tour in Mallorca.

Apart from being extremely knowledgeable, she also happened to be very funny. What is interesting to note in going through these responses, is that how similar they are to responses in another research project conducted in the area of teacher training. The same instruction was given, namely, write about a teacher you admire. The qualities that were prioritised in the subsequent discussions were almost identical to those we found in this study. A good guide should be knowledgeable in his or her area, a good communicator, enthusiastic about the site or subject, capable of relating to and managing a group, and have a pleasant voice and a personality. These are qualities that appear in other research, in both tourism and teaching (Biggs 2003; Cherem 1977; Cranton 1992; Cross 1981; Knowles 1980).

Results from participant observations also revealed the same set of skills or competencies. What was interesting was that in the guided experience of the four mines, the various guides exhibited most of the above qualities but in different degrees. The female guide in Kiruna was extremely knowledgeable and had the advantage of building on the experience itself—a journey in a small bus into the bowels of the earth. In all the mines, the dramatic location added to the experience, but what was interesting to observe, was how the guide built on or took advantage of the site itself. In almost all cases, guides interpreted places of interest. But what interests one tourist, as Jessica mentioned above, might not interest another. In the abandoned coal mine at the Dutch and Belgian border, the guide relied heavily on his use of humour, and his own confident and playful personality. The experience of a former gold mine in an Australian theme park called Sovereign Hill, was fascinating but owed more to the site itself than any memorable 'performance' on the part of the guide. What is interesting to note is that, in this case, there was a large clump of tourists, whereas in the Swedish iron mine the visitor group was small (about six people), and comprised family and friends, who had persisted that the
mine be opened and explained to them. In the latter case, the guide was not qualified but the intimacy of the experience was more rewarding than the production line feeling one got at the theme park. An interesting conclusion from the participant observation part of this study was that the guide must be conscious of his or her context and exploit its advantages.

**Implications for the Training of Tour Guides**

The authors would like to argue that the good guide should be not only knowledgeable and skilful in his or her area of interpretation (specific capabilities) but also be able to research information and interpret it in an ethical, interesting and sensitive manner (generic capabilities). There are, of course, other specific and generic skills that should be taught or engendered in tour guide training, many of which will depend on particular situations and contexts. Who is responsible for mapping these skills? In the vocational education field the established norm, in Australia at least, is that local, regional and national agencies that include college, government and industry representatives oversee the skills audits that are used to define generic and specific competencies. They also make sure that they are regularly updated. The advantage of this system is that a number of stakeholders are involved, and as a result, political, economic and socio-cultural issues are negotiated. The conferring of a certificate, diploma or degree involves a wide range of interest groups. Teachers and students will tend to endorse capabilities that were integral to their idea of the good guide. A responsible industry will stress the need for economic sustainability (Mowforth and Munt 1997), whereas politicians will hopefully support guiding skills that promote a form of tourism that is in line with treaties and agreements.

Mapping specific and generic skills in tour guiding is one thing. Teaching them is another. At the subject and course level, individual teachers and teaching teams can help improve the individual student’s skill by varying traditional ways of teaching. Lecturers, for example, can help engender communication skills by making sure that students have to work together in and across subjects, by videotaping them presenting ideas verbally both as individuals and in groups and by adapting lectures so that they are more interactive. It is not impossible, for example, to get students to do work in pairs during lectures. Field trips, such as the ones mentioned earlier, are also excellent opportunities to develop a range of communication skills (Cranton 1992). Administrators can help by designing teaching and meeting places that really encourage interaction. Lecture halls may persist at tertiary institutions because of economies of scale but there is no reason why the seating arrangement has to always imply one-way communication. Rows of fixed seats can be replaced with groups of swivel chairs to allow students to communicate more easily with others nearby. In other words, timely planning by funding bodies can also help ensure that the media they pay for deliver the right messages. Industry, government and other funding bodies can also seek expert guidance on how generic capabilities might be fostered before committing large sums of money to teaching and learning infrastructure.
Ultimately the responsibility for developing generic skills rests with the learner. Learners learn; teachers, institutions, government, professional bodies, industry and ultimately society can either facilitate or hinder their learning. In a world where established values have been eroded, some of the most important generic capabilities are linked to values. Tourist guides are crucial agents in the changing paradigm of tourism business. They are the face of a large and growing sector within tourism. It is they who interpret the sites, whether that site is a historical building like the Taj Mahal, or a national park, such as Kakadu, where control is shared between government and indigenous landholders (Christie and Spiers 1997). What do major stakeholders in the tourist industry want from guides? Again the question is complicated and can only be answered with reference to other discussions in this book. These discussions touch on the rapid development of tourism in new destinations and regions (often culturally and environmentally sensitive), the balancing of commercially viable tours with sustainable ones (not killing off the goose that lays the golden egg) and the creation of more holistic tourist experiences. Today, the good guide has to have a much better understanding of his or her role in this changing paradigm. As tourists seek new and more exciting experiences and look for people to help interpret them, the guide must be conscious of conflicting values and the ethics involved in resolving them. Rapid changes within tourism raise many ethical issues. Tour guide training must take account of this and try to inculcate the ethical values associated with this particular calling. It is important that students also develop a generic capability that enables them to analyse their own actions and those of others, and make ethical judgements about them (Agryris and Schon 1974; Mezirow and associates 1990). More importantly they need to act on the basis of such judgements.

The hardest part of introducing generic competencies into a tourist guide curriculum is how to know if attempts to engender such skills have been successful or not. Fortunately, the competency based training movement (CBT) helps somewhat. If guides undertake training over a number of months or years and are required to learn by doing (Dewey 1916); the lecturers involved in the course have the opportunity of making a professional judgement regarding their communication skills, cross-cultural awareness, ethical behaviour, and concern for and understanding of a sustainable tourist experience. Lecturers can also base their judgement on student portfolios that provide evidence of their reflection on and acquisition of such generic skills. The portfolio should be complementary to the observed practice. The criteria on which the student is assessed needs to be made clear from the beginning and activities be designed that do indeed test, continuously and in a varied form, the acquisition of the sort of generic skills mentioned all along.

These skills could be acquired before or during the course, but even if a student already possesses them, there should be some indication of further development or refinement during their formal education. CBT was originally introduced as a non-graded system. People who underwent courses were assessed and deemed competent or not competent. As has been indicated earlier in the chapter, it is important that in any assessment of generic capabilities,
grading should be avoided. Grading generic capabilities is very difficult, especially when one tries to do so with skills that involve attitudes and values (Biggs 2003). In this respect vocational education can learn a lot from non-formal adult education. If training institutions, course teams and individual trainers committed themselves to developing the capability for ‘transformative learning’ in all their graduates (Mason and Christie 2003), they would lay the foundation for a successful generic capabilities programme.

Essentially, transformative learning equips the individual with the capacity to recognise the paradigmatic, causal and prescriptive assumptions that underpin his or her belief system, to hunt down those that are invalid and enact changes accordingly. Changing behaviour is, of course, the hardest thing to achieve in this process (Brookfield 1990; Mezirow and Associates 1990). It ultimately depends on the individual’s willingness to change. The influence of peers, mentors and the educational environment itself can help here. But until the trainee guides recognise that there is a need for change, that their ‘habits of mind’ or ‘frames of reference’ need a change, no such change is possible. Tour guide training can help develop this capability by emphasising analytical and critically reflective thought in all subjects. But sometimes, this is not enough. A commitment to transformative learning, which deliberately hunts the assumptions underlying all aspects of tourism training (knowledge, skills and attitudes) and helps trainee guides determine their validity, is a first step in engendering the sort of generic capabilities that characterise the ‘good guide’.
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