Policy at the margins: Views from Leeds about local authority tourism policy activity.

By Nancy Stevenson

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of PhD in Tourism

October 2006
Abstract

This thesis investigates the factors affecting tourism policy making in an English local authority and is developed from a social/human conceptualisation of policy making. It focuses on the experiences and perspectives of the people involved in the development and delivery of policy.

The author adopts a qualitative methodology that is developed from grounded theory, but also includes ideas and insights from complexity theory to create a theoretical approach that is grounded in the experiences of policy makers. Interview data is analysed to identify key themes and characteristics of the development and enactment of tourism policy in Leeds in an attempt to broaden understanding of tourism policy making. The findings are presented using the multiple voices of the policy makers and identify the specific complexities associated with tourism policy enactment and delivery in Leeds. These themes and characteristics are investigated in the context of the literature on tourism planning and policy, complexity, public policy and ideology; historical analysis of tourism policy making in England, and in Leeds and primary research into local authority policy making in Cambridge.

The research identifies a process where the relationship between tangible policy and the action of policy makers is blurred and sometimes contradictory due to changes in the wider policy environment. It identifies tourism policy occurring on the margins of local authority policy making, in a turbulent environment and with multiple connections with other policy areas. It highlights the extent that tourism policy is the result of communication and negotiation, the importance of intangible activities associated with this communication and the paradoxes and contradictions inherent in policy making. The research questions some of the prevailing conceptualisations of tourism policy and the dominance of positivist approaches to tourism policy making in terms of their linearity and assumptions about causality and association.

This research provides an alternative approach to understanding policy that is grounded in the experiences of those in the field. It suggests that a new theoretical approach to understanding tourism policy is needed in order to broaden the conceptualisation of policy making and deepen understanding of tourism policy, taking account of its wider characteristics and their implications and is developed from what happens in practice.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis presents research on the factors and circumstances influencing tourism policy making, from the perspectives of the policy makers. It is focussed on one English local authority (LA), Leeds City Council (LCC) but draws from interviews from Cambridge to contextualise its findings. It investigates some of the more complex issues affecting tourism policy/planning, including the dynamic changes within the policy environment and other contextual changes including those arising from ideological debates about broader public policy and party politics. This research is developed using grounded theory and is reliant on information collected in the field from the perspectives of people who are involved in or influence the tourism policy process. It develops an alternative approach to the tourism literature that focuses on the technical and more tangible aspects of the process of developing a plan or a set of policies (Godfrey & Clarke, 2000; Gunn 2002, Inskeep, 1991; Veal, 2002, WTO, 1994). It provides detailed research on LCC identifying key themes and characteristics of tourism policy making in an attempt to broaden understanding of tourism policy making. The purpose of this chapter is to clearly identify the origins, justification and contribution, objectives, challenges and structure of this research.

The origins of the research

The author has a particular interest in policy making in LAs having worked for a decade as a town planner in three English LAs and having taught and undertaken research into tourism planning since the mid 1990's. In 1998 she undertook consultancy research for the English Tourist Board (ETB) to monitor the effectiveness of their Regional Planning Programme, a programme set up to provide comparative data about tourism planning policy covering England. This research illustrated that the programme brief was reinterpreted by each of the Regional Tourist Boards which meant that 10 different sets of data were developed and the project could not achieve its aims (Stevenson, 1998). This research developed an interest in the circumstances and factors that lead to gaps between policy intent and the enactment of policy. In 2000 she devised and led a research project The Role of English Local Authorities in Tourism (RELAT), which undertook a survey of English LAs (Stevenson & Lovatt 2001). The RELAT survey investigated the tangible elements of tourism policy making, including the structures,
policies, research and budgets. The analysis of the survey material identified a number of contradictions, inconsistencies and a complex array of contextual issues affecting tourism policy and planning (Stevenson 2002). In particular the survey highlights a number of contradictions between policy intent and the enactment of policy. While there is considerable LA activity to develop tourism plans/strategies there appears to be minimal monitoring research or funding for the enactment of those policies.

The current research stems from the experience of both of the research projects identified above but is most directly developed from the findings of the RELAT survey and the author’s desire to investigate some of the contradictions and complexities in tourism policy making in more depth. A PhD was chosen as the vehicle for further research on the basis that it provided more freedom and a longer timeframe than other forms of funded research. This enabled the researcher to develop and test ideas over a five-year period with relatively few constraints and, after a transfer to the University of Surrey, the support of two excellent supervisors.

The justification for and contribution of the research

The research makes a contribution to existing research and literature in tourism in several ways. Firstly, it reviews tourism literature and questions the applicability of some of the ‘universal’ concepts and theory in the tourism literature to the study of tourism policy in the English LA context. It considers the characteristics of tourism policy making in this context and investigates wider literature on public policy, ideology and complexity to see if stronger links should be made with those fields. It identifies several myths about tourism policy and provides a basis to analyse tourism policy, taking into account characteristics, circumstances and complexities arising in the English context.

The first part of the literature review considers tourism planning and policy theory focussing on its assumptions and its links with more established fields. It considers dominant theories and models used to conceptualise tourism policy, such as process theory and systems theory, and outlines the critiques of those models. The second part investigates complexity literature, considering its applications in tourism, in wider public policy studies and in organisational analysis. It identifies the limitations of the use of chaos and complexity theory in the tourism literature and discusses how complexity
theory might be used to develop an understanding for tourism policy in this research. The third part considers public policy literature that is focussed on changes in the British political and policy context, and uses traditions developed by Getz in 1987 (1999, 2001) as a basis to develop historical analysis of tourism policy development at the national level in Britain. It also uses the RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001) and case study material (including Agarwal, 1999, Hope & Klemm, 2001, Thomas & Thomas, 1998) to identify some characteristics of tourism policy making by LA's in England.

This research makes a contribution to the tourism literature by adopting a social/human perspective of the policy making process and developing theory from the views of those people involved in tourism policy. It contributes to current debates about qualitative methods and methodology in tourism studies and develops research strategy, drawing from grounded theory and complexity theory, which is focussed on developing theory from evidence and experience 'in the field'. It presents two narratives which provide a policy maker perspective of tourism policy making, an alternative to the more plan focussed approaches by earlier researchers (including Godfrey & Clarke, 2000; Gunn, 2002; Inskeep, 1991; Veal, 2002 and WTO, 1994). It draws attention to the importance of the day-to-day activities of tourism managers as they try to negotiate a place for tourism policy on the wider policy and political agendas. The study highlights the marginal relevance of the tangible tourism strategy, particularly in Leeds, where a rapidly changing policy environment means key policy makers have forgotten it. The study questions the rationale for researchers to focus on tangible plans in a context where these appear to have marginal relevance to policy enactment.

The theory emerging from the study highlights key themes and more detailed characteristics of tourism policy making at the local authority level. These make a contribution by challenging some of the dominant conceptualisations of tourism policy and providing an alternative starting point for developing an understanding that is grounded in the experiences of those involved in the process. The conclusion of the thesis presents clear arguments why further research should be developed to focus on the actions and interactions people to broaden understanding of the tourism policy process as a social rather than a technical process.
The objectives of the research

The research reflects a concern that much tourism planning literature still appears to be rooted in outdated rational and technical conceptualisations, with recent research (including Burns, 2003; Hail, 2000) referring to the work of Chadwick (1971, 1978). It draws on public policy and complexity literature as a way of widening the discussion about tourism planning to include its societal context and complexity. The research question was developed as a result of the findings of the RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001). The research aims have been influenced by wider policy theory, in particular the debates by public policy theorists, including Ham & Hill, (1997), Hill (1997), O’Toole (2000), Schofield (2000), about the implementation or enactment of policy and Byrne, 2001, Medd, (2001), Sanderson (2000), who discuss the implications of complexity on the enactment and evaluation of policies.


Research question

What are the main factors that influence tourism policy in an English LA in the view of those people involved in the process?

Research aims

1. To identify and investigate the complex factors/circumstances that influence tourism policy activity and develop understanding of the:
   a. nature and dimensions of those factors (what they are and how they affect policy activity)
b. relative importance of those factors

c. relationships between those factors

d. implications of those factors for the practice or enactment of tourism policies

2. To provide a new perspective on tourism policy activities informed by the opinion of local policy makers

3. To build theory that is grounded in the experiences and perceptions of local policy makers.

4. To develop a theoretical approach that provides new insights and broadens understanding of tourism policy making and planning to focus on what happens in practice and take account of its broader implications.

Research approach

The decision to develop the research from perspectives of the people involved in policy making arises from the researcher's experience as a LA policy maker, and as a researcher of tourism policy in the English context. This has developed her belief that the interactions between people are key in the development and delivery of policy. In LAs these are influenced by a range of contextual factors some of which are tangible (policy, party politics) and some of which are less easily defined (personalities of key politicians and officers in other departments, developments in neighbouring authorities).

The aim of this research is to adopt an approach that can encompass a policy conceptualisation taking in wider debates about the context within which policies are made and the people who make them. It has been designed to consider the relationships between contextual aspects providing an alternative to many existing studies which are positivist and are focused on the creation of tangible policies and quasi-scientific techniques to develop and measure policy. The research

- focuses on the practice of tourism policy making in a specific context and is designed to acknowledge and accommodate the connections, complexities and dynamism of tourism policy making in that context;
- focuses on participants in the process and their interpretations of what is important and relevant in tourism planning; and
rejects positivist approaches. It is developed using grounded theory, to structure and analyse primary research in the field and is developed from three stages of fieldwork and analysis. One key aspect of this approach is that the participants and the fieldwork are at the centre of the theory development.

- It is non-linear and involves the researcher moving forward and backward through the data. For example, the majority of the historical analysis and literature review were undertaken after the fieldwork to situate research within its broader context and to interrogate findings.

Initially it was envisaged that the study would be based in Leeds and Cambridge. These LA’s were chosen using the findings of the RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001), they were both regional centres with a formal engagement in the tourism planning process and key policymakers in both were willing to engage in this research. The decision to focus on Leeds in 2005, as the study progressed, was based upon the findings and experiences of the interviews undertaken in 2004 and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Challenges

The two major challenges of this research arose as a result of the constraints imposed by the requirements of the PhD. The first relates to the time frame of the study which meant that the primary interview material was collected in three stages over two years. The study illustrates turbulence and change but is conducted within a very short timeframe, which presents considerable challenges in analysing the material and ascertaining whether the characteristics have a resonance over a wider time period or whether they exist very specifically in one time. Historical analyses at national and local level are developed in an attempt to locate and contextualise the findings in a broader timeframe.

The second challenge relates to the constraints arising from the study being undertaken by one researcher. Some of the issues about being a lone researcher were resolved after the transfer to the University of Surrey on the basis that the researcher could present and discuss her ideas with her supervisors. However some of the challenges were more difficult to resolve for example the researcher found it particularly difficult to
develop the rapport necessary to secure open and honest discourse with one interviewee. In a research team setting she would have developed a further interview with another member of the team to see if they could develop rapport.

The third relates to the research being carried out on a part-time basis. This presented challenges for the researcher to create blocks of time in which to undertake primary research, undertake analysis and write up her findings. She adopted a method whereby the primary research was enacted in very intensive bursts and transcription and analysis spanned over a longer time frame and was undertaken on a weekly basis. This approach had the disadvantage that sometimes several weeks elapsed before interviews could be written up and coding took several months. The advantage of the method was that the gaps between research periods allowed for a fresh perspective. The process of re-immersing in the data appeared to be overly time-consuming at times but had the positive effect of constantly re-engaging the researcher with the data and allowing her to view it from different angles.

A fourth challenge arose from the decision to develop a grounded approach. This was outside the researcher's experience and that of her colleagues, requiring some courage that theory would emerge from the coding processes identified by Glaser (1969, 1978, 1992, 1993, 1998) and Goulding (2002). The grounded approach also presented considerable challenges in terms of the difficulty in suspending prior knowledge and this is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Structure

Chapter 2 forms the first part of the literature review and considers the literature that investigates the nature of tourism planning and policy. It investigates the roots of tourism planning theory, identifying the linkages between tourism planning literature and the wider literature on planning and public policy. It considers the dominant theoretical approaches and models used to conceptualise tourism policy making and identifies some of the assumptions that underpin these approaches. It then evaluates the contribution of emerging research and debate on this study.
Chapter 3 considers the wider literature on chaos and complexity theory to investigate whether it provides insights that are useful for the study. It considers seven key concepts from complexity theory that are relevant to this research and discusses the ways they have been used and applied in the wider public policy literature. This chapter also specifically considers the current applications of complexity theory in the tourism literature and identifies the need to move beyond these and to think about the methodological implications of complexity.

Chapter 4 is developed from the understanding that policy making in English LA’s is context specific and investigates the context within which LA’s develop and enact policies. It considers the British literature on politics and ideology, modernisation and governance in order to develop an understanding about dominant ideology and current approaches to public policy making at the national level. It discusses how changing ideology and national initiatives shape approaches at the regional and local level. This chapter presents historical analysis of national tourism policy and the organisational arrangements to develop and deliver policy and discusses the characteristics of policy using theory developed by Getz (articulated in Chapter 2). It also presents analysis of tourism policy action at the local level using survey material by Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) and relevant case study research.

Chapter 5 outlines the conceptual orientation and methodological approach adopted for this research. It identifies the concepts underpinning the research strategy and their implications for data collection and analysis. It then outlines the detailed research process adopted for this study referring to the literature on grounded theory and focussing on the detailed methods of data collection and analysis. It provides an account of the way that grounded theory was adopted (and adapted) during this study and the detailed account of the approach to analysis providing evidence of the process used to develop theory that was grounded in the data.

Chapter 6 provides historical analysis outlining the involvement of LCC in tourism service provision and policy making since 1977 (when it first became involved in tourism) to the present time. It identifies five distinct phases of activity and considers the characteristics of the Council’s involvement in each of these phases. It outlines the current local policy framework and organisational arrangements for tourism, identifying
the relationship between the Tourism Strategy for Leeds (TSL) and wider council policy. Finally it considers the wider policy environment focussing on specific national and regional policies that have an impact on local tourism policy making in Leeds.

Chapter 7 presents a thematic narrative that identifies the main factors that influence tourism policy in Leeds from the perspective of key policy makers. It is presented as two narratives that are developed from the interviews in 2004 and 2005. This chapter explores the relationship between tourism policy and wider policy at the local level, the extent and nature of communication between tourism policy makers and other policy makers at local and regional level, the changes in the local policy environment, the nature of regional tourism policy and its relationship with local policy. The narratives are drawn together under three themes and six characteristics and at the end of the chapter their implications are discussed.

Chapter 8 considers the findings of the narratives, drawing upon primary research from Cambridge and the wider literature on complexity and public policy making. It explores the nature and the dimensions of the themes and the characteristics that were identified in the Leeds narratives. It identifies paradoxes and contradictions in the development and delivery of tourism policy then considers the implications of the findings of the study for conceptualising and theorising tourism policy making.

Chapter 9 concludes the thesis, outlining the contribution of this research to developing and deepening understanding of tourism policy making in the context of an English LA. It also discusses the contribution of this study to current debates on qualitative methodology in tourism and discusses its limitations. It highlights the practical implications of the findings of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

Summary

This chapter presents an introduction to the research outlining its origins and justification. It briefly outlines the concepts underpinning the study, the approach to collecting and analysing data and its objectives. It explains the structure of the thesis, briefly identifying the content of each chapter.
CHAPTER 2 TOURISM PLANNING AND POLICY THEORY

Introduction

This review has been developed across three interconnected areas of literature and explores key concepts, debates and theories that contribute to the understanding about public sector tourism policy making. Chapter 2 discusses literature that specifically theorises and conceptualises tourism planning and policy making. It considers some of the assumptions that underlie the dominant approaches and investigates the challenges posed by emerging theory. Chapter 3 considers how concepts from complexity theory have been applied to tourism phenomena. It then investigates the application of complexity theory to wider organisational and social policy research to see how complexity theory might provide a way to developing understanding about tourism policy making. Chapter 4 argues that public policy making is context specific and investigates the context of the study considering the wider literature on public policy and ideology in England. It presents historical analysis of the English approach to tourism policy making at a national level and identifies its characteristics using Getz’s traditions (developed in 1987, updated in 2001 and summarised in Hall 2000, Hall & Page 2002). It then considers literature and survey material relating to the nature of tourism policy making by local authorities (LAs). It uses this information about tourism planning in England to question some of the assumptions in the wider tourism literature and to highlight the issues that are relevant to developing an understanding of tourism planning by LAs in England.

The nature of tourism planning and policy

In this chapter the nature and definition of tourism planning and policy is considered, drawing attention to the disciplinary perspectives that have influenced the debates in the field. Dominant theoretical approaches to conceptualising and researching tourism policy are discussed including Getz’s traditions, process models, systems, institutional approaches, stakeholder and network theory. These are evaluated in the light of recent developments in the tourism literature, and the emerging discussion about integrating different approaches. The issues raised in selected case study research are investigated in terms of the context and complexity of policy making. This information is
used to identify the relevance and resonance of different theories, models and concepts and to consider how they might inform the study of tourism planning at the local level in England.

The need for government intervention to regulate tourism activity is widely accepted by tourism researchers and policy makers. There is growing recognition that the free market does not always lead to effective or acceptable outcomes for host countries and communities. Gunn (2002) Hall (2000) and Inskeep (1991) claim that governments need to prepare plans and policies to provide the necessary guidance for tourism development and activities. Jeffries (2001) argues the complexity of tourism "calls for coordination and cooperation, which arguably only governments have the authority and apparatus to organize" Jeffries (2001:108).

Tourism planning researchers (including Godfrey & Clarke, 2000; Gunn, 2002; Hall, 2000; Inskeep,1991; Veal, 2002 and WTO,1994) share the view that through planning and policy making, governments can limit failures in the market and can enhance the long term viability of tourism developments and products. They borrow from economists, spatial planners, geographers, sociologists, business/management and public policy theorists to conceptualise and research tourism planning and policy. Most of the literature about public sector intervention in tourism has been drawn together under the heading tourism planning and private sector planning activities tend to be discussed within tourism management literature.

Most definitions of tourism planning emphasise the process of making a plan. For example it is defined as

"the process by which decisions are made as to the optimum way to implement policies and achieve goals" Veal (2002:6).

Planning is "a process for visualizing and guiding action to avert pitfalls and meet challenges of the future" Gunn (2002:7).
There is generally agreement that planning "is directed toward the future" (Hall 2000:8) but there has been debate about the tendency for some definitions to focus on the plan or the process. Hall (2000) argues that planning should be distinguished from a plan and identifies wider contextual aspects that affect tourism planning such as the interdependent relationships between decisions and the influence of power. Initially it is useful to identify the main disciplinary approaches underlying the definitions of tourism planning.

The roots of tourism planning theory

Tourism planning is influenced by a number of disciplines including town planning theory (which in turn draws on theories developed by geographers, economists, social scientists and environmental scientists), economic theory, management theory (drawing largely from marketing and organisational theory), and public policy theory. Each of these disciplines makes different assumptions about the nature of planning, and has developed its own techniques and approaches. In the absence of a dominant approach to tourism planning, researchers and practitioners have a wide range of choices about the definition and approach they adopt. There appears to be a tradition of "dipping into" and drawing from a wide range of approaches developed in more established fields on the basis of political/policy environment, the nature of the problem and, to an extent, the education, and values of the researcher.

This multi-disciplinary approach to conceptualising and researching tourism planning has led to a lack of cohesion in the literature which is broad, fragmented and underpinned by a number of assumptions that are not clearly articulated. Costa (2001) and Hall et al. (1997) say that tourism planning is a discipline that is still in search of its own identity in terms of theory, perspectives and concepts. A number of researchers including Hall (2000), Pearce & Butler (1999) and Pforr (2005) claim that there is a need to integrate tourism planning theory and approaches which could lead to theory which has more cohesion and depth. The next section will consider tourism planning theory and practice in terms of its relationships with town planning, economics, management and public policy theory. It will then consider the development of integrated theory.
Gunn (2002), Inskeep (1991) and WTO (1994) perceive planning as a means of influencing the way people shape the environment and justify planning on the basis that it produces a better environment than that which could be generated by the market alone. In the British context, studies by Costa (2001) and Heeley (1981) consider the history of tourism and town planning and identify clear links between the two fields. Costa (2001) examines the roots and the evolution of tourism and town planning theory and practice in Britain, making comparisons and identifying the interactions between both fields. He contends that tourism planning has developed as a specialisation of town planning claiming that tourism planning theory has evolved more slowly, with many of its premises imported from the rational planning paradigm. He argues that town planning is supported by mature planning schools whereas tourism planning has often progressed in reaction to particular situations and been directed according to market interests (Costa, 2001). Hall (1997, 2000) develops his definition of planning from the work of researchers who are associated with the town planning field in Britain such as Chadwick (1971,1978) Cullingworth (1997) Hall, P. (1992) and Healey (1997). In the Australian context Dredge (1999) clearly identifies the roots of tourism planning in town planning and says

"Planning is the process of establishing a strategic vision for an area which reflects a community's goals and aspirations and implementing this through the identification of preferred patterns of land use and appropriate styles of development" (1999:774).

Tourism planning researchers who develop their ideas from town planning theory (and its parent disciplines) draw attention to the needs and involvement of the local community, the environment, sustainability, and the context in which public policy is carried out. Some definitions of planning from this field have a clear link with the wider public policy making literature and will be discussed further below. One interesting issue is the decision of many contemporary tourism researchers (Burns 2003, Getz, 1986; Hall et al, 1997; Hall & Page, 1999 and Hall 2000) to draw from work by Chadwick on systems that was originally published 1971. In British town planning literature this technical "scientific" approach was challenged from the 1980's by ideas from community
development (Arnstein, 1969; Nicholson, 1973; Cresswell, 1974 and Williams, 1977) and wider social policy research (including Barrett & Fudge, 1981; Ham & Hill, 1984). The continued reference to Chadwick (1971, 1978) in the tourism literature is not reflected in the wider planning literature and goes some way to explaining the persisting dominance of technical and rational approaches in tourism planning.

Historical analysis in Chapter 4 demonstrates the extent that the conceptualisation of tourism planning as a development of town planning theory is overstated in the British context. It is clear that the two fields have developed with a different purpose and from a different set of ideals (the former being driven by economic concerns and the latter by environmental and social concerns). It is also clear that town planning and tourism planning are dissimilar in terms of their legislative, institutional and funding contexts which has implications on their status and nature.

**Economics**

Economic definitions conceptualise tourism planning in terms of economic development and regeneration. The rationale for government intervention is related to market failure, market imperfection and public or social concerns about market outcomes (Hall, 2000).

"...business is rarely interested in long-term social and environmental need as opposed to short term revenue and profits" (2000:19).

An example of market failure is the failure of the market to protect the environment. In tourism this arises partly because tourism businesses compete for environmental resources many of which are "free" in that they have no monetary value but are finite. Also governments may become involved in wage and employment regulations to protect the needs of individual citizens (Williams & Shaw, 1998).

It is clear that public intervention has been driven by an economic rationale in many countries. Dredge & Jenkins (2003) claim that economic concerns are at the heart of tourism policy in Australia. Williams & Shaw (1998) claim that public tourism policy in Britain has an economic rationale and outline the economic considerations leading to public sector involvement in tourism in Britain. These include improving the balance of
payments, fostering regional development, diversifying the economy, increasing public revenue, improving income levels and creating new employment.

**Management approaches**

Marketing and management approaches to tourism planning focus on techniques and methods that can be adopted at the various stages of preparing a tourism strategy. They have been developed from a rational conception of a sequential policy process and provide a series of technical exercises to underpin the development of a plan. The approaches adopted by Godfrey & Clarke (2000), Inskeep (1991) and WTO (1994) are focussed on tourism development, draw on the work of management and marketing researchers and borrow methods and techniques to develop plans i.e. situation and SWOT analysis. They conceptualise tourism planning as being primarily concerned with the preparation of tourism strategies that have broad ranging marketing and economic development objectives.

**Public policy approaches**

Since the 1990's it has been more difficult to delineate boundaries between tourism planning and tourism policy because ideas about integration and sustainability have created a much broader philosophy of planning. Also tourism planning/policy has been carried out by a wider range of actors with a broader remit. Increasing attention has been given to issues in the policy environment drawing from the wider public policy literature (Chambers & Airey, 2001; Davidson & Maitland, 1997; Elliot, 1997; Hall & Jenkins, 1995; Hall et al., 1997; Hall, 2000 and Veal, 2002). Policy conceptualisations focus attention on the policy environment, the interaction between different policy initiatives and the various actors in the tourism policy process.

"Public policy-making is first and foremost a political activity. Public policy is influenced by the economic, social, and cultural characteristics of society, as well as by the formal structures of government and other features of the political system. Policy should therefore be seen as a consequence of the political environment, values and ideologies, the distribution of power, institutional
frameworks, and of decision-making processes (Simeon, 1976; Hall & Jenkins, 1995; Elliot, 1997)" (Hall 2000:8).

**Strategic and sustainable approaches**

More recently tourism planning literature has included ideas and techniques from wider literature on sustainability (Gunn, 2002; Hall, 2000; Mowforth & Munt, 2003; Twining-Ward, 2002 and Veal, 2002;) and there is evidence that chaos and complexity theory underpins some contemporary studies (Dredge & Jenkins, 2003; Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; McKercher, 1999; Miller & Ritchie, 2003; Pforr, 2005; Russell & Faulkner, 1999 and Twining-Ward, 2002).

Strategic and sustainable planning approaches have emerged from a mixture of ideas and methods from the economic, land use and business/marketing planning perspectives. Hall (2000) claims that strategic planning approaches typically include decision making which is iterative or cyclical. He claims that a strategic approach is likely to take account of emerging discourse about sustainability and draw attention to the context that shapes tourism planning. As a result of the increasing interest in the environment or context of planning, a number of recent studies including those by Dredge & Jenkins (2003), Treuren & Lane (2003) and Tyler & Dinan (2001b) have focussed on the roles of stakeholders and organisations in the environment and have drawn from the developments in organisational literature and network theory.

**Developing understanding of tourism policy making in English LAs**

Tourism planning and policy making occurs in a wide variety of contexts, and is influenced by a range of political and historical factors and social values. It is defined using ideas from a number of disciplines and is conceptualised in different ways in different places. In this study the term policy is used to define the planning and policy activities of LAs and includes future oriented activity that involves the public sector. A policy conceptualisation encompasses wider debates about the context within which policies are made and examines relationships between contextual aspects rather than the detailed techniques and methods involved in the preparation of a plan. A policy approach directs attention to policies evolving in the context of social phenomena.
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including politics, power relations, values and relationships, rather than a set of standards or procedures.

Conceptualising tourism policy making - dominant theories and models

This section will explore the dominant models and approaches used to conceptualise and research tourism planning including Getz's traditions, process models, systems approaches, institutional approaches and stakeholder and network theory, highlighting some of the assumptions underlying these approaches and their limitations.

Traditions

Getz's traditions (Getz 1999, 2001, Hall, 2000, Hall & Page 2002) are useful for this study because they highlight the variety of ways of conceptualising and implementing tourism planning and

"the different and sometimes overlapping ways in which tourism is planned, and the research and planning methods, problems and models associated with each" (Getz, 1987 cited in Hall & Page, 2002:309).

Getz identifies four broad traditions to tourism planning which have been discussed, developed and disseminated by Hall (2000) and Hall & Page (2002). Each tradition is discussed in terms of its emphasis, its underlying assumptions about tourism planning, its definition of the planning problem and its views about appropriate methods for research and analysis. The traditions are not meant to represent a chronological ordering and are not mutually exclusive, as destinations or countries often develop policies underpinned by a mixture of the different traditions at the same time.

The boosterism tradition is typified by the view that tourism development will have automatic benefits to the host community and tends to be promoted by those who will gain financially or politically from development. This approach has been criticised for its lack of resident involvement in the planning process. Boosterism can be identified in the planning of "mega-events" such as the Olympic games, Expo and the planning of Millennium projects such as the Dome and the London Eye. The boosterism tradition is
likely to result in policies to develop tourism and favour marketing, public relations and advertising to promote growth (Hall, 2000; Hall & Page, 2002).

The economic tradition is focussed upon the economic impacts of tourism and conceptualises tourism as an industry which can be used as a tool to achieve economic growth, restructuring and regional development. This tradition emphasises the potential value of tourism as an export industry that can contribute to the balance of payments or levels of foreign exchange. This approach uses marketing and promotion to identify and attract the market segment that will create the greatest economic benefit to the destination. This approach gives economic goals priority over social and environmental goals but limited attention is paid to the negative impacts of tourism to attempt to ensure that host communities have a positive attitude towards tourists (Hall, 2000; Hall & Page, 2002).

The physical/spatial tradition originates out of theory and practice developed by geographers and spatial planners in the 1960's and 1970's such as Chadwick (1971, 1978). Getz typifies this approach as being rational with the aim to create spatial patterns that are better than those produced by the market and to minimise the negative impacts of tourism on the physical environment. This tradition is concerned with the physical and social carrying capacity of an area and seeks to minimise environmental impacts of tourism through visitor management. The spatial tradition emphasises the production of plans, which consider the capacity of the natural resources of an area, but is criticised by Hall (2000) as it fails to consider social and cultural attributes.

The community-oriented tradition (Murphy, 1985) reflects developments in policy theory from writers such as Arnstein (1969), and town planning theory in 1980’s. It “emphasises the social and political context within which tourism occurs and advocates greater local control over the development process.” (Hall & Page 2002:312).

This tradition perceives the community, rather than the tourists, to be the focal point of the tourism planning exercise and focuses on the social impacts of tourism. The approach is "bottom up" and the planners' role is as facilitator, planning with the
community rather than *for* the community. An example of this in the British context would be "Planning for Real" a participation tool/exercise that was developed during the 1980's using community development methods to create interest and involvement in connection with specific development sites. The incorporation of community views into the tourism planning process is problematic due to the political nature and the complexity of the process and this tradition presents difficulties in terms of implementation (Murphy, 1985 and Hall, 2000). Research indicates that the nature of the political process in many countries prevents the community from having the degree of control that is implicit within this tradition (Arnstein, 1969; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Ladkin & Bertramini, 2002).

Hall (2000, 2002) notes the growing debate around sustainability since Getz identified the four traditions in 1987 and suggests that a sustainable tradition has emerged as a fifth broad approach. He argues this tradition integrates features of the economic, physical/spatial and community approaches to provide a holistic method to planning. He claims this requires a new style of policy making and changes to the organisational structures that make and deliver policies. The sustainable tradition is focussed towards the longer term goal setting and draws in a broader range of ideas about policy making, recognising the political dimensions, the environment and the relationship between different policy areas. Hall (2000), Hall & Page (2002) claim that this tradition brings equity and equality into the decision making process and implies that this should become more inclusive with a more significant role to public debate and controversy. Pearce & Butler (1999) state that the pursuit of sustainability as a policy objective implies the linking or integration of elements within the policy environment and a much broader understanding of the impacts of policies across traditional disciplines. The sustainability tradition draws attention to the complex environment in which policies are enacted and has contributed to the debates about traditional methods and approaches (Farrell & Twining-Ward 2004). Treuren & Lane (2003) claim there has been a "gradual replacement of 'boosterist' logic of tourism planning with sustainability based models....." (2003:13) but the historical analysis in Chapter 4 shows there is little evidence in the British context to support this and the impact of this tradition is overstated in the context of this study.
Process models

Process models conceptualise the policy process as a sequence of distinct activities. Inskeep (1991) and WTO (1994) develop linear stage models to identify a series of activities that occur in the policy process. Inskeep's (1991) model identifies eight stages in the tourism planning process which lead from study preparation, to plan formulation, implementation and then monitoring (1991:28). He provides an explanation of what each of the stages entails but there is very little discussion about the operation of the model and the factors that drive the process from one stage to the next. A similar model is developed by the WTO (1994) showing a staged linear process to operationalise a plan and identifying some basic techniques and checklists to illustrate what a policy planner or government might do at each stage. These approaches identify a step-by-step procedure and are presented as if they are universal and can be applied to any national or regional planning situation.

Linear models have been widely criticised (Barrett & Fudge, 1981; Ham & Hill 1997, Hill, 1997 and Schofield, 2000) and have been largely superseded by policy cycle modelling which shows policy making as a circular or iterative sequence. For example Veal (2002) identifies a staged process model which he claims is common to all planning exercises. This cycle progresses through nine distinct stages each associated with a specific activity including environmental appraisal, consulting with stakeholders, deciding strategy, implementation, monitoring and feedback. Gunn (2002) illustrates an eleven-stage model by Steiner (1991) that operates at the destination/local level and shows the rational planning process. This process is cyclical, identifies eleven stages in preparing a plan with education and citizen involvement at each stage. Whilst both of these cyclical models are developed from a rational perspective they are framed in broader terms than the linear models. Veal (2002) frames his conceptualisation of the tourism planning process within a discussion about strategic planning and Gunn (2002) within a discussion about the role of the community in the planning process. However neither study effectively makes links between their staged process models and the context within which they operate.
Models that conceptualise tourism policy as a staged process continue to play a prominent role in tourism literature and frame much contemporary research into tourism planning and policy. These models are rational, prescriptive, and seek to demonstrate how planning and policy making should happen (Hall et al, 1997). This type of modelling is based on the “rational, perfect public administration model which builds upon the bureaucratic assumption of the separation of policy from implementation; the presence of a myriad of control measures and tight boundaries of discretion” (Schofield 2001:251).

The advantage of these prescriptive models is that they provide a simplified version of the policy process that is clear, accessible and focuses on the tangible parts of the process. They provide a guide to common activities, methods, techniques, and research that ideally should be undertaken when developing a tourism plan. The disadvantage of these simple models is that they create a false sense of clarity because they define the process in a partial or blinkered way. Veal (2002) and Gunn (2002) recognise some of the institutional and environmental factors that affect policy making but their work is focussed on the narrow, tangible elements of the process underplaying the wider political or relational aspects. In focussing on the tangible elements they underplay the less visible, less stable, ambiguous and uncertain elements that have major implications on the policy process.

Process models have been criticised by a number of tourism researchers (including Burns, 2003; Elliot, 1998; Faulkner & Russell, 1997; Hall & Jenkins, 1995, Hall et al, 1997; Hall, 2000; McKercher, 1999 and Pforr, 2005) on the basis that they underplay its wider contextual characteristics, including power and competing interests. Process modelling focuses attention on the tangible plan, implies a degree of rationality that does not exist in the real world and lacks analytical capability. Pforr (2005:333) identifies problems with the determination of the boundary of each stage in the policy process and claims that this does not reflect “political reality, where overlaps and parallelism are evident”. John (1998) criticises process models on the basis that they assume “every policy has a beginning, a middle and an end and the task of the policy analyst is to describe how policy moves from one stage to another” (1998:36). Pforr (2005) expresses concern that
process models do not have the "power to explain what factors drive the policy process from one phase to the next" (2005: 333) and ignores the interaction with other policy cycles. He criticises process models for their rigidity in defining clear phases and overemphasis on sequence and formal arrangements.

However, it should be noted that despite their criticism, all except Elliot (1997) develop or illustrate models that are influenced by rationalistic thinking and reductionism. For example Hall (2000) illustrates two process models one at the regional level and one at the local level in South Australia, which although context specific, make assumptions that parts of the policy process such as implementation can be delineated and separated. Despite Pforr’s (2005) criticisms about process models he claims they still provide a useful analytical tool, particularly when they are combined with other models developed from systems and policy network theory.

This section has demonstrated the continued popularity of models that conceptualise stages in the policy process and focus on what should be done at each stage. This approach to policy analysis does not adequately explain the relationship with the political/environmental and social context within which policies are developed and delivered and constrains learning or understanding. These prescriptive approaches are characterised by rationalism and reductionism and largely ignore long running debates in wider policy analysis (including Barrett & Fudge, 1981; Hill, 1997; John, 1998 and Schofield, 2001). Prescriptive approaches fail to take account of a turbulent policy environment and the "messiness" of the policy process arising from "behavioural complexity, goal ambiguity and contradiction." Schofield (2001:249). For this study process modelling has been rejected on the basis that it ignores the context of the decisions, resourcing, politics, power and the inability of policy makers to collect comprehensive information about tourism.

**Systems approaches**

Systems approaches attempt to develop understanding about the wider environment in which tourism occurs providing a view of the components and interrelationships in the "tourist system" (Gunn, 2002; Hall, 2000 and Pforr, 2005). In the tourism policy context, systems theory could be used to draw attention to the extent to which tourism is
interdependent with broader economic, social and environmental policy and a range of complex interactions and relationships that affect the policy process. However many tourism systems have been criticised for their failure to do this on the basis that they model parts of systems and do not capture the idea of systems being embedded and interacting with wider systems (Getz, 1986; Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; Pforr, 2005 and Twining-Ward, 2002).

Recent definitions of systems have drawn from the ideas of complexity theory. Hall (2000) draws his definition from work by Capra;

"a system is an integrated whole whose essential properties arise from the relationships between its constituent parts. Systems thinking is therefore the understanding of a phenomenon within the context of a larger whole" (Capra, 1997 cited in Hall, 2000:42).

Pforr (2005) says,

"Public policy, understood as a highly complex process of problem solving, is influenced by an interplay of various economic, socio-cultural, political and physical factors. This policy environment determines the approach to political problems and shapes policy responses by governments. It is therefore imperative to discuss the policy process with reference to its environment" (2005:327).

Historically there have been two broad debates about the adoption of systems approaches in tourism. One is developed on the basis that systems modelling has the scope to develop understanding of tourism but in order to do this, it needs to be more fully integrated (Getz, 1986; Dredge, 1999 and Pforr, 2005) or more able to take account of complexity (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; Hall, 2000 and Twining-Ward, 2002). The other is developed from the idea that systems modelling does not reflect the characteristics of tourism and that other approaches are more appropriate to understanding tourism. Proponents of this approach draw attention to the descriptive nature of systems and their lack of analytical ability (Choy, 1991; Jafari, 1987 and Kerr et al, 2001). These ideas are investigated in more depth below.
Systems modelling needs to be integrated and account for complexity

The literature on complexity theory is discussed more fully in Chapter 3 but this section considers some contributions from tourism researchers who use complexity theory to critique systems modelling. McKercher (1999) notes the paucity of conceptual discussion about tourism systems and organisation and contends that "much critical thought about tourism remains entrenched in an intellectual time warp that is up to 30 years old" (1999:425). Twining-Ward (2002) is critical of simple tourist systems modelling claiming that generally the system "is defined in simple linear terms" (2002:74) and ignores other essential elements in the external environment. She draws from complexity theorist Gleick (1987) and outlines the difference between simple systems and complex systems saying,

"simple systems are linear and expected to function in a predictable fashion rather like a machine, with large inputs yielding proportionally large results. Complex systems, function in a non-linear fashion, and even quite small inputs can produce multiple and unpredictable outcomes ..." (Twining-Ward, 2002:74)

Examples of simple systems are Mill & Morrison's (1985) model of the destination as a system that consists of a mix of attractions and services that are related and dependent upon one another. Their model identifies markets, travel destination and marketing as key components but does not seek to explain how that system is embedded within and interacts with other systems. Twining-Ward (2002) discusses the tourism systems developed by Leiper (1979, 1990) and Simmons & Leiper (1998) that separate the tourism system into the traveller-generating region, the transit route regions and the tourist destination region. She claims that the "systems" described are more like geographically functional regions than systems and criticises this approach for its failure to consider the properties of the wider systems, its failure to consider the internal interactions and external connections between components and to determine hierarchy.

Twining-Ward (2002) claims that many researchers (including Gunn, 1988, 2002; Leiper, 1979, 1990; Mill & Morrison, 1985 and Murphy, 1985) have described tourism systems in a reductionist manner focusing on core functions and ignoring the complex inter-
relations between each of these functions and other elements. The failure to integrate the different systems approaches are acknowledged in tourism literature by a number of researchers (including Inskeep, 1991; Getz, 1986; Gunn, 2002; Pearce 1989). However, despite the recognition of the problem of over simplifying the tourism system, these over simplified systems continue to dominate tourism policy literature. This perhaps reflects an innate human desire to simplify and reduce complex phenomena as a way of demonstrating understanding of them.

Some researchers have attempted to identify systems that are integrated and reflect the complexity inherent in the tourism system. Dredge (1999) argues that existing models have "not yet achieved a sufficiently integrated conceptual basis for a comprehensive understanding of spatial characteristics of destination regions" (1999:772). She develops a systematic model which is set within a spatial planning framework and brings together existing models and concepts relating to travel patterns, attraction systems and nodal systems as a basis to understand the normative and functional aspects of destination planning. Hall (2000) attempts to identify an integrated model of the tourism policy system that takes account of context and complexity and translates Easton's systems model (1965) of the political system into the tourism policy arena (Pforr, 2005). This model illustrates the interplay between policy processes and the policy environment and demonstrates the extent to which they should be understood within the context of its political environment. It highlights factors such as values, ideology, the distribution of power, and established policy structures and practices. However, this model is criticised by Pforr (2005) on the basis that it is overly simplified and lacks analytical capability.

Several researchers have developed ideas about how systems theory could be developed to take account of the wider environment and complexity. Pforr (2005) claims that systems theory needs to be integrated with process and network theories to enhance their analytical ability. Twining-Ward (2002) Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004) suggest that tourism systems need to be understood in the context of multiple systems. They claim that researchers need to develop comprehensive or whole systems by exploring connections and interactions outside the "core system" (2004:279).

It is disappointing that the researchers who perhaps bring the most exciting insights about complexity and integration into tourism literature still resort to modelling in a way
that is reductionist. Hall (2000) and Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004) are critical of models that fail to take account of complexity with the latter explicitly criticising reductionism. However, both demonstrate difficulty in escaping the Newtonian paradigm, using models that reduce and simplify very complex processes and have limited analytical ability. There is an issue here about duality of logic and despite their calls for non-linear, complex thinking, they draw from models which have been developed from deterministic and cause and effect thinking. The models they use simplify interrelationships and fail to demonstrate the dynamism of those relationships. Whilst there is evidence that a number of tourism planning researchers are challenging traditional approaches to defining "the tourism system" there is very little evidence of systems research that is not reductionist and that is able to conceptualise the policy process in a way that takes account of dynamic policy environment. This raises two questions the first is whether tourism systems might be too complex to define and model comprehensively and the second is whether systems thinking offers an appropriate approach to understand tourism policy making.

Systems modelling does not reflect the characteristics of tourism

Jafari (1987) claims the failure to model tourism systems arises due to unique character of tourism phenomena at each destination and calls for local studies. Kerr et al (2001) query the utility of existing systems frameworks which have been developed to understand organisational dynamics. In particular they draw attention to the open systems model of inter-organisational analysis developed by Pearce (1992, 1996) on the basis that it is highly descriptive and subjective. While Pearce recognizes that tourism organisations operate in a dynamic environment his model does not capture that dynamism and gives a static "snapshot in time" 2001:649. Kerr et al (2001) claim that systems modelling focuses on "structural level descriptions of the relationship between institutions" (2001:650) and produces "thin" description, which largely ignores the social processes within the internal organisation. Choy (1991) claims that the systems approach is burdensome and suggests an alternative would be to adopt a flexible approach to planning depending upon the situation faced by the community.

Although systems' modelling offers some interesting insights into tourism policy making by drawing attention to context and relationships, tourism systems have been criticised
for their "tendency to oversimplify" and their lack of "sufficient explanatory power." (Pforr 2005:338). Dominant models have been criticised on the basis they define components very broadly, draw attention to more tangible parts of system and the most obvious relationships, they focus on parts of systems, and do not take account of the relationships between systems. They have tended to be reductionist producing thin description that ignores the dynamics within the environment and have not provided the analytical tools to investigate context (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; Kerr et al, 2001; Pforr, 2005 and Twining-Ward, 2002). Pforr (2005) draws on the work of Ham & Hill (1984), Hill (1997) and Czada (1997) saying that systems modelling leads to an over simplification of the policy making process which diminishes its analytical abilities.

Institutional approaches

Some tourism researchers investigate the institutional factors that shape policy as a way of exploring tourism policy (including Dredge & Jenkins, 2003; Elliot, 1997; Hall & Jenkings, 1995 and Tyler & Dinan, 2001a&b). Institutional approaches are developed from an understanding that public policy is developed and shaped within political and public institutions. The arrangements within and between these institutions, structure and constrain the nature and dimensions of policy. Institutional approaches highlight the importance of understanding the structures of government and the roles and functions of other institutions involved in the policy process in order to understand the policy making process (Hall & Jenkins, 1995).

An advantage of institutional analysis is that it highlights the formal rules and traditions of a policy arena, uncovering the variety of different conventions and procedures that characterise policy making and implementation. It highlights the complex characteristics of tourism policy making and provides a basis from which to explore some of the ambiguities and paradoxes. It draws attention to the tourism policy environment which is characterised by organisational fragmentation and tourism policies being framed simultaneously within different policy areas. Treuren & Lane (2003) claim the contribution of the institutional and organisational literature in tourism policy theory development has been its role in questioning rationality and the deterministic thinking that assumes "organisations are maximising entities who implement policies intended to optimise returns and minimise opportunity costs" (2003:3) and normative thinking where
a preferred option is identified by managers and is then implemented. However in wider public policy analysis institutional analysis it has been criticised for underplaying the political and social processes of public policy making. John (1998) claims "institutions are just one factor constraining public policy choices (1998:65).

**Stakeholder and network theory**

Stakeholder and policy network approaches were developed in wider policy analysis in the 1980's as a response to concerns that some policy research was too rational and not applicable to the real world. Dowding (1995) and Pforr (2005) claim that the policy network approach has become the dominant paradigm for the study of public policy. This claim is perhaps overstated in relation to tourism policy studies where approaches have been eclectic and no single approach appears to dominate the literature. However policy network theory and stakeholder theory both appear to be gaining ground and is evidenced in recent research by Bramwell & Sharman (1999) Tyler & Dinan (2001a & b) Ladkin & Bertramini (2002) and Treuren & Lane (2003). Stakeholder approaches highlight the

"plurality of organisational interest groups and the political nature of organisational goal setting and policy implementation" (Treuren & Lane 2003:4).

Policy network approaches focus on "policy communities" made up of people who interact within policy networks. They analyse the policy process from the perspective of the people who are involved in the process and recognise "the complex, diffuse and non rational nature of the policy process" (Pforr 2005:334). Network approaches are based on the idea that "policy emerges as a result of informal patterns of association" (John, 1998:66) and consider the dynamics of "complex relationships" by examining them "as they shift and change" (John, 1998:91). Tyler & Dinan (2001b) argue that network theory is applicable to research "a complex, fluid and young field of study such as tourism."

(2001b:212)

"Network theory, though not perfect at explaining the policy-making dynamic, does explain the complexity of the policy arena and the multi-dimensional nature of it. The theory recognises specialisation within the economy and the sector
and also the dynamic relationships between groups and the state bureaucracy" (Tyler & Dinan 2001b:243).

Network theory is criticised by John (1998) in the wider policy literature on the basis that it can only explain partial and incremental changes and is too descriptive. He claims that a major problem with the network approach is that it offers "an incomplete or partial explanation of policy change and variation" and "does not account for how those relationships form and why they change" (1998:91). He contends that networks need to be linked to other factors such as interests, ideas and institutions which determine how networks function. John (1998) claims that both institutional approaches and network approaches have explanatory power in the context of stability, but claim other approaches such as 'ideas based' approaches are more appropriate in the context of change. There is no explicit discussion of 'ideas based' approaches in the tourism literature, however Tyler & Dinan (2001a) draw from the theoretical discussion by John (1998). They undertake historical analysis of tourism policy making by national government in Britain, which indicates that changes are incremental rather than radical and argue that in the British context a predominantly network approach is appropriate to study tourism policy.

**Assumptions behind the dominant approaches to tourism policy making**

Much tourism policy theory is developed from the rational planning paradigm and rationalist ideas and models still dominate the literature (Costa, 2001; McKercher, 1999). The rational paradigm is based on the assumption that governments are capable of shaping and influencing tourism activities and development, and that methods exist to transfer government policy into action. The dominant paradigm is based on the idea that policy makers can ameliorate problems for countries and destinations by undertaking a sequence of research and policy activities. The paradigm is illustrated in the following quotes

> "In order to achieve effective development patterns and not generate serious environmental problems, all aspects of the area or development sector being planned must be understood and carefully integrated, and the environmental and social implications of development taken into account" (Inskeep1991:27).
"Tourism planning calls for research, first to assess the level of demand or potential demand for a particular region, secondly to estimate the resources required in order to cater for that demand, and finally to determine how these resources should best be distributed" (Holloway, 1998:265-266).

In this section, five broad approaches to understanding the tourism policy process are outlined. Two of these have been rejected for this study, these are policy process modelling and systems approaches, both of which are criticised on the basis of their rationalism, reductionism and their assumptions that the policy environment is relatively stable. The former presents a simplified model identifying distinct stages of policy formulation and implementation and assumes that the researcher can identify and analyse separate pieces of the policy process. Systems modelling offers scope to understand context, however the dominant approaches to systems modelling are criticized for being partial and reductionist. Both of these approaches have been criticised on that basis that they ignore the conflicting interests, complexity and dynamism in the political environment.

Three approaches are useful in evaluating the material for this study. Getz's traditions categorise and delineate different approaches to tourism policy making. They will be used as a basis for the historical analysis in Chapter 4. Also the institutional, stakeholder and network approaches are of interest as they move away from rational conceptualisations and start to focus on the political environment and power arrangements within society. Some of the broad ideas for these approaches are used to discuss the findings of the primary research in Chapter 8.

There is still some evidence of normative thinking and tourism research that is framed within a consensual view of society. Until recently there has been minimal discussion about different ideological perspectives on the nature of society. Examples of consensual approaches are found in the claims that if the community are involved in planning that "tourism development will reflect a consensus of what the people want." (WTO, 1994:9) or the claim by Gunn (2002) that
“Every stakeholder of tourism will gain, not lose, by making plans in the context of tourism as a system” (2002:68).

More recent research that encompasses institutional, stakeholder and network theory challenges prescriptive and rational conceptualisations of the policy process. Some of this research questions universal conceptualisations of tourism planning and supports the idea that specific environments are likely to generate specific and different approaches to tourism planning. These ideas will be discussed further below.

Emerging research and debate

The dominance of the rational paradigm has been challenged by a number of researchers who draw from chaos and complexity theory (including Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; Hail, 2000; McKercher, 1999; Russell & Faulkner, 1999; Twining-Ward, 2002 and Tyler & Dinan, 2001). These challenges raise fundamental questions about the way tourism is conceptualised, suggesting a paradigm shift, and will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. The remainder of this chapter will investigate research and debate that is more closely aligned with developments in orthodox theory e.g. the debates about integrating theory, the challenges posed by institutional, stakeholder and network theory, and the findings of relevant case study research.

Combining and integrating different approaches

There is a growing body of research which supports the idea of the use of multiple approaches in order to understand tourism policy making. Dredge & Jenkins (2003), John (1998), Pforr (2005) Treuren & Lane (2003) and Tyler & Dinan (2001a&b) argue that single approaches fail to explain policy change, offer partial accounts of political action and lack analytical capability. They claim that when approaches are combined they can begin to account for complexity, dynamism and change. Dredge & Jenkins (2003) reject “single lens” or framework approaches and draw upon ideas from exchange and resource dependency theory, social and economic theory and institutional theory to explore relations between different layers of government in tourism policy making. Treuren & Lane (2003) combine theories about organisations, institutional structures, stakeholders, ideology, economics and sustainability to develop a framework
to analyse tourism policy. Chambers & Airey (2001) identify the links between political ideology, and economic theory in the development of tourism policy. Tyler & Dinan (2001a&amp;b) draw from chaos theory highlighting the extent that tourism is derived from different sectors of the economy and is "effected by a huge range of non-predictable, evolving relationships"(2001a:211). Their approach relies on network theory primarily, but also draws from institutional theory, and in their historical analysis includes reference to economics and political theory. The broader literature on politics and policy will investigate further in Chapter 4.

Pforr (2005) identifies the multiplicity of different approaches to policy analysis and claims the researcher has scope to choose. The approach adopted reflects upon assumptions about society, political interaction and conflict, and the choice will impact on the outcomes of research. He claims

"The different methods, models and explanatory tools available should, however, not be regarded as primarily conflicting but rather as different viewpoints, which can complement each other in a combined approach" (2005:327).

Pforr (2005) argues that process modelling, systems approaches and network approaches can be combined to develop a methodological framework to understand the tourism policy. He claims the systems approach provides "an important perspective of analysis to comprehend the broader policy-context of the study area" (2005:338), the policy process approach adds a dynamic dimension, by including the consideration of time horizon and the policy network approach to allow consideration of actors in the process. He uses this framework to study of tourism public policy in Northern Australia.

There is evidence of a variety of different mixes of methods in the tourism literature and appears to be a general consensus that this is a progression on the single method research developed in the past. In the wider policy literature, John (1998) investigates different approaches to analysing policy including heuristic (process models), institutional, network, socio economic and rational choice theory. He argues that each presents a partial explanation and that single approaches tend to describe policy rather than explaining why it changes. The variety of theories outlined in the tourism literature might give the impression that policy researchers are relatively free to choose a method
or mix of methods based upon the problem they are investigating. However in wider policy research there is some concern about this. John (1998) claims;

"such an eclectic strategy would be misplaced, partly because of the defects of each of the individual approaches, and also because the research problems are all aspects of the same quest for explanation in politics" (1998:202).

Case study research

Many of the researchers who combine and attempt to integrate different approaches develop their research in a specific context. Case studies are used to present a detailed picture of the environment in which a particular tourism policy is created and enacted. The advantage of the case study approach is that the researcher can consider the cultural, environmental and political context of the policy process and can investigate what happens as policies are developed and implemented (Hall et al, 1997). Case studies recognise the extent to which policy making is affected by "a complex interplay of political-historical, constitutional, demographic and socio-cultural determinants" (Pforr 2005:337) and can include investigation into the irrational and less tangible aspects of policy making such as people, politics and power.

Case study research in tourism is characterised by a variety of approaches. Some studies focus on the interactions and relationships between stakeholders and the characteristic of networks that influence the policy process. They reflect upon the wider political context within which decisions are made and draw attention to the power inequalities that are embedded in society, moving away from the consensual conceptualisations that characterise rationalist approaches. For example Tyler & Dinan (2001a) investigate how networks and relationships shape the tourism policy process in Britain. Tyler (1998) identifies the changing relationships and nature of lobby groups, the impacts of changes in leadership and the emergence of partnerships in Southwark. Bramwell & Sharman (1999) evaluate collaboration in tourism policy making in the Peak District and identify the minimal impact that collaboration has on existing power imbalances. Ladkin & Bertramini (2002) evaluate collaboration in the tourism planning process in Cusco, Peru, and identify inequalities in power that hinder collaborative approaches.
Case studies have also been developed to investigate the implications of political and economic factors on policy making and planning. These studies have tended to highlight some of the political and practical difficulties in developing and implementing policies. In the British context case studies by Agarwal (1999) Hope & Klemm (2001) and Kerr et al (2001) show that a variety of factors affect the enactment of policies. Agarwal (1999) considers the implementation of Tourism Development Action Plans (TDAP) and identifies methodological difficulties in assessing their implications, including lack of data, incomparable data and the impact of wider issues in the policy environment. She highlights factors that impact on the effectiveness of programmes including poor cooperation and limited communication between the public and private sectors, arising from personality clashes and between leadership issues.

Hope & Klemm (2001) consider tourism policy in Bradford in a case study that illustrates how the national funding policy affects LA tourism policy (discussed further in Chapter 4). Kerr et al (2001) consider politics and policy in Scotland and develop a detailed case study, using ‘thick’ description, in an attempt “to capture the complexities and dynamics of changes in Scottish tourist organisations”. They focus on process and their analysis outlines the complexities and paradoxes within the Scottish tourism administration. Their study questions the utility of existing mechanisms and techniques to evaluate tourism policy making claiming that many models favour broad level rather than focussing on the detail of what is occurring within organisations.

**Recognising context specificity**

The case studies above investigate tourism planning and identify the distinctiveness of the political, economic and social environment in which tourism policy decisions are made. They demonstrate

“...the importance of the specific policy environment as an important parameter to comprehend policy processes. Public policy shapes and is shaped by a specific set of local characteristics, an amalgamation of distinct political, socio-economic and physical factors” (Pforr 2005:337).
The extent of these contextual differences is illustrated by a study by Dredge & Jenkins (2003) providing a detailed historical analysis of tourism policy and institutions in Australia. It is clear from this study that there are a number of contextual differences between Britain and Australia. Dredge & Jenkins (2003) indicate that tourism policies and institutions to support those policies have existed in Australia since the 1940's. In Britain research by Heeley (1981), Tyler & Dinan (2001a) indicates the state did not directly engage in tourism policy making until 1969 (apart from the National Parks legislation). In Australia, Federal and State responsibilities for tourism, and institutional arrangements have changed over time but there has been an on going commitment to state engagement in tourism policy making. In Britain, the state's commitment has wavered and there has never been a statutory commitment to tourism policy making at the local level. Dredge & Jenkins (2003) contend there has been recognition that tourism is significant to the Australian economy for over 20 years and it has attracted political interest and debate. In Britain research by Thomas & Thomas (1998) and Tyler & Dinan (2001a&b) indicates support for tourism policy has wavered over the same period at the national level and has been characterised as a marginal tourism activity with minimal public interest.

There is some evidence that some of the 'universal' theory development is based on context specific case studies, many of which are based in Australia. If tourism planning is context specific then the mix of methods advocated by Pforr (2005) may be appropriate for studying tourism policy in the Northern Territory in Australia, but inappropriate for studying tourism policy in LA's in Britain. Systems approaches may be more appropriate in the Australian context where government views and approaches are more embedded within wider policy processes and more tangible. The issue of context specificity is considered in more detail in Chapter 4 and influences the research methodology adopted for the study.

Summary

This chapter highlights the variety of conceptualisations of and approaches to tourism planning and policy making. It investigates several dominant approaches in terms of their assumptions and their relevance to the study. It then identifies emerging research that attempts to integrate the traditional approaches and draw from wide policy theory. It
identifies the extent to which research into tourism policy is characterised by a multiplicity of different conceptualisations, approaches and techniques and researchers have considerable scope to choose between different approaches.

Despite the variety in definitions and techniques, a dominant approach has emerged underpinned by positivist and rational conceptualisations of the policy process. The continued dominance of positivism has led to a proliferation of models and frameworks that aim to define process and environment. Positivist approaches are criticised on the basis that they pay little attention to what happens in practice. Since the 1990's some tourism researchers have started to develop ideas from the wider literature drawing from theory developments in areas such as public policy, sustainability and complexity. These researchers have questioned rational conceptualisations and reductionism in the literature. In Chapters 3 and 4 the wider research on complexity and public policy will be investigated in more depth in order to ascertain whether they offer insights and methodological approaches that might be appropriate to the study but that are beyond those already in the tourism literature.

The extent to which positivism, rationalism and reductionism are ingrained into tourism theorising is illustrated by the continuation of many theorists (including Hall, 2000; McKercher, 1999; Pforr, 2005; Twining-Ward, 2002) to develop simplified and reductionist models to illustrate complex ideas. This presents a contradiction as the researchers who challenge positivism and reductionism are still engaged in rational and reductionist modelling. For example Hall (2000) questions some of the rational assumptions in process modelling but produces models of the planning process that reflect rational thinking, making assumptions about the linearity of the process, the clarity of boundaries between 'stages in the process' and ignoring the 'messy' realities of government policy making. Much of the planning policy literature demonstrates this contradiction and despite the growing body of work on integration, sustainability and complexity there is still a proliferation of simple models and frameworks that are presented as if they might have universal applicability. In the tourism policy literature positivism is questioned but positivism, linear thinking and rational modelling continue to thrive.
Recent case studies have highlighted the limitations of positivist thinking and highlighted the complexity and context specificity of tourism planning. This research highlights the extent to which tourism policy making reflects the economic, political and social environment. However this case study research into tourism policy is developed from an eclectic range of theoretical perspectives. The disadvantage of this is that the research does not clearly link together under one set of rules or dominant perspective and does not form a coherent body of knowledge.
CHAPTER 3 CHAOS AND COMPLEXITY THEORY

Introduction

The previous chapter outlined a challenge to the dominant paradigm to tourism research, a challenge which has been developed by a number of researchers including Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004) Faulkner & Russell, (1997), McKercher (1999), Ritchie et al (2003) Russell & Faulkner (1999) Twining-Ward (2002) and Urry (2003). They have started to develop ideas from chaos and complexity theory and have questioned models and conceptual frameworks which reduce and simplify the world in order to try and understand it. In this chapter these ideas will be explored in more depth, drawing from the wider social and public policy literature on complexity theory and highlighting concepts that are relevant to the study of tourism policy. This chapter draws from the debates in the wider literature and discusses how complexity theory might be used to develop understanding of tourism policy for this research.

Chaos theory

Much of the tourism literature on complexity draws from chaos theory and looks at the chaotic parts of tourism systems. Chaos theory provides explanations of unexpected and unanticipated outcomes and points to the impossibility of long-term prediction. Stacey (2003) says that in some circumstances

"iterative, recursive, non-linear systems operate in a paradoxical dynamic characterised by uncertainty" (2003:221).

He uses the example of changes in the weather to explain that whilst this behaviour has a pattern in a broad sense, the specific path of behaviour is unpredictable. A number of theorists including Stacey (2003) and Mitleton Kelly (1998) stress the importance of the paradoxical dynamic of chaos with the coexistence of stability and instability, predictability and unpredictability. This paradoxical dynamic can lead to behaviour that appears random and lacking order and a state of "chaos" in which uncertainty dominates and predictability breaks down. McKercher (1999) says both chaos and complexity theory
"emerged from the realisation that many systems operated in a complex, non-linear, non probabilistic, non deterministic and dynamic systems manner and not as a machine" (Gleik, 1987; Kellert, 1993; Overman, 1996 cited in McKercher, 1999:428).

The principles of chaos have been explored in various fields and have been found to apply in meteorology, physics, chemistry and biology (Gleik, 1988; cited in Stacey, 2003). Much of the early work on chaos within complex adaptive systems that informs complexity theory in the tourism literature, was based upon occurrences within the natural environment and was framed by research by biologists and ecologists. More recently economists, social and political scientists have started to develop and adapt chaos theory as a way of understanding human systems. Specifically in the tourism literature Faulkner (2001) Faulkner & Russell (1997, 2001) McKercher (1999), Ritchie et al (2003) and Russell & Faulkner (1999) have considered chaos theory as a way of understanding the complexity of phenomena associated with tourism. McKercher (1999) develops a chaos model that highlights the variety of interrelationships between nine different elements in "the tourism process". Russell & Faulkner (1999) investigate the role of chaos makers in destination development. Chaos theory has been used to underpin Faulkner's (2001) disaster management framework, which was discussed and developed in studies by Faulkner & Vikulov (2001) and Miller & Ritchie (2003).

The differences between chaos and complexity theory

In the tourism literature chaos and complexity theory are often discussed in a manner that suggests they are interchangeable and identical. In the wider literature Byrne (2001) notes that chaos and complexity are not the same. Haynes (2001) contends that complexity theory has developed from and uses the language of chaos theorists but has adopted different methods of research. Mitleton Kelly (1998) claims

"Chaos theory and complexity may share certain characteristics but differ in so far as a complex adaptive system is able to evolve and to change" (1998:6).
Harvey (2001) contrasts complexity theory, as advocated by the researchers from the Sante Fe Group and chaos theory as advocated by Prigione and the Brussels Group. He claims that complexity theory is focussed on

"mathematically modelling the inner structuration or internal subsystem of complex systems while chaos theory"..."uses models from statistical, non-equilibrium thermodynamics to study the external system of complex systems" (2001:3).

He claims the Sante Fe Group conception of complexity is reformist and involves extending existing methods to non-classical, non-linear systems and "scientizing" the humanities whereas chaos theory stems from an agenda of reform, seeking to revolutionise science by unifying human and physical sciences (Harvey 2001). Stacey (2003) contrasts the approaches adopted by chaos and complexity theorists claiming that the former are often looking for an overall 'blueprint' for the whole system whilst the latter are more likely to model agent interaction at the local level.

**Complexity theory**

From the Sante Fe perspective, complexity theory developed as a result of the ideas and problems presented by chaos theory. In the 1970's and 80's theorists used developments in computer science to try to map, programme and understand patterns within apparently chaotic systems. Theorists from different disciplines (initially physics, biology, computer science and economics) started to discuss and theorise about the implications of chaos and complexity on their disciplines.¹ This led to complexity theory being developed across disciplines sharing and borrowing ideas from those disciplines and testing ideas using a variety of methods (Lewin, 1993; Waldrop, 1992).

"Complexity refers to the condition of the universe which is integrated and yet too rich and varied for us to understand in simple common mechanistic or linear ways. We can understand many parts of the universe in these ways but the larger and more intricately related phenomena can only be understood by

¹ The Santa Fe Institute played a key role in bringing together academics from a range of disciplines to discuss and research complexity in the 1980's and 1990's. Key researchers include Arthur, Gell Man Lewin and Waldrop.

It is not possible to identify one complexity theory as different approaches have been developed in different disciplinary fields as researchers have sought to understand various aspects of diverse systems within complex environments (Mittleton Kelly, 1998; Medd, 2001). Furthermore the dominant view or orthodoxy of complexity developed by the Santa Fe Group is increasingly being discussed and challenged by management theorists and social scientists. There appears to be a growing gap between natural and social scientists in terms of understanding complexity, its implications, appropriate research methodologies and the validity and logic of modelling complex interaction in social or human systems. Medd (2001) explores the methodological problems in using models developed by complexity scientists highlighting some of the assumptions that are inherent in key complexity concepts and the constraints and bias that these concepts might impose on research. He suggests that policy theorists may need to stand back or ‘dis-connect’ from complexity theory in order to develop sensitivity to the complexity of social phenomena. Fonseca (2002), Harvey (2001) and Stacey (2003) recognise the extent that social phenomena are socially constructed and argue that researchers cannot stand outside of social systems and model them. This presents a challenge in terms of developing an appropriate methodological approach to researching tourism policy and will be explored in more detail later in this chapter and in Chapter 5.

It is useful to consider some of the key concepts used in complexity theory and to discuss their relevance to social phenomena and specifically to policy analysis. Complexity scientists have developed a range of concepts to define and explain their ideas. These concepts are referred to as metaphors and describe phenomena and dynamics in complex environments. These concepts have been discussed in the literature by a few tourism researchers (such as McKercher, 1999; Russell & Faulkner, 1999), who have discussed oft-cited examples such as the ‘butterfly effect’. However there has been very little discussion in the tourism literature about the assumptions underlying these concepts and the issues associated with applying them to tourism. This will be discussed later but initially it is useful to explain several concepts and to evaluate their relevance to researching tourism policy.
Complex adaptive systems

Complexity theory seeks to understand changes in complex adaptive systems. The term complex is used to describe a system in which interaction is detailed, and where agents make choices about their individual actions. A complex system is adaptive in that it influences and is influenced by its environment. The complex adaptive system consists of a large number of agents each behaving according to a set of rules or principles that require the agents to interact with, and adjust their behaviour to that of other agents. The idea of a complex adaptive system draws attention to the extent that components within systems provide opportunities and are constrained by linkages to each other. The implication of these linkages is that behaviour within these systems is both patterned and unpredictable (Battram, 1999; Stacey, 2003). A complex system exists within an environment comprised of other complex systems and constantly adapts and changes in response to feedback from the environment. The interactions between different systems are constantly changing which means that the notion of "equilibrium" is meaningless (Brightman, 2001; Battram1999). In the tourism literature Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004) say the complex adaptive system has

"interdependent and integrated parts, constantly evolving, and in general not amenable to analysis by orthodox linear, deterministic science" (2004:276).

Emergence

Emergence or self organisation is a key characteristic of a complex adaptive system and is connected to the innovation and learning that occurs through piecemeal changes to the internal structure of these systems (Manson, 2001). Battram (1999) claims that complex adaptive systems appear to be “adaptively intelligent” and are constantly evolving and learning. In human or social systems, emergence describes the way that behaviour and qualities of systems emerge from local uncoordinated interactions involving many participants. It is a ‘bottom up’ process arising when the collective behaviour of interacting individuals results in an organisation or part of a system adapting. Stacey (2003) says
"local self organising behaviour yields emergent order for the whole system" focussing on the "system's internal capacity to evolve spontaneously" (2003: 237).

Complexity texts commonly discuss the changes in the economy as examples of emergence in a social or human system by referring to emergent qualities such as volatility and the herd behaviour of stock market investors. While economists commonly attribute these qualities to irrationality or imperfect markets, complexity theorists argue that these qualities are intrinsic to rational, local interactions and their non-linear consequences (Waldrop, 1992; Manson, 2001). Emergence draws attention to the idea that the behaviour of a system cannot be predicted or envisioned from knowledge of what each component of a system does in isolation.

"One of the most important characteristics of complex non-linear systems is that they cannot, in general, be successfully analysed by determining in advance a set of properties or aspects that are studied separately and then combining those partial approaches in an attempt to form a picture of the whole" (Gell Man cited in Battram, 1998:12)

Emergence leads to the situation where the capacity of a complex system will be greater than the sum of the constituent parts (Battram, 1999; Casti, 1997; Manson, 2001; Stacey, 2003; Waldrop, 1992;). However Urry (2003) claims

"It is not that the sum is greater than the size of its parts – but that there are system effects that are somehow different from its parts" (2003:24).

The implications of emergence on policy making within complex environments are that changes in complex adaptive systems may be too complex for human agents to understand and control. Tosey (2002) claims that the notion of emergence challenges politicians, managers and policy makers to acknowledge that they can only influence rather than control action within a complex environment.
The edge of chaos

The edge of chaos, Battram (1999) Tosey (2002), is also termed the zone of complexity, Stacey et al (2000) or bounded instability Mitleton Kelly (1998) and describes the transition phase in a complex system where ordered behaviour co-exists with disordered or turbulent behaviour (Battram, 1999; Mitleton Kelly, 1998). The edge of chaos occupies the area between order and chaos, and is a place of intense learning, innovation and creativity (Battram, 1999; Tosey, 2002), the point of maximum fitness, or maximum evolvability (Lewin, 1993). At the edge of chaos changes can occur easily and spontaneously as the system breaks with the past to create new modes of operating (Stacey et al, 2000; Battram, 1999) and new systems of order emerge from the disorder giving rise to the paradox of order existing with disorder (Mitleton-Kelly 1998). Forces, such as emergence, push organisations or systems towards the edge of chaos and away from the extremes of stability and randomness (Scheinkan & Woodford, 1994; cited in Battram, 1999 and Manson, 2001).

Battram (1999) Mitleton Kelly (1998) and Stacey (2003) identify the paradoxical dynamic at the edge of chaos where apparently conflicting elements appear to be operating at the same time, such as stability and instability, predictability and unpredictability. In terms of understanding policy dynamics the edge of chaos challenges some of the traditional assumptions about policy making i.e. the idea that for success contradictions and paradoxes must be resolved and the tension that they cause, relaxed. This traditional approach equates success with dynamics of stability, regularity and predictability. The edge of chaos opens up the possibility that contradictions and paradoxes can never be resolved. It highlights the dynamics of policy making and action in terms of continuing tension that generates patterns that are irregular, unstable and unpredictable and challenges the way of understanding and researching policy to take account of contradiction and paradox. In relation to this research the notion of edge of chaos provides some useful insights into the nature of policy making in a complex environment. It highlights the need for a research strategy that accommodates the inherence of contradiction and paradox and enable them to be embodied within theory development.

Several writers have considered the type of decision making that takes place at edge of chaos and draws attention to what Zimmerman (2001) calls 'garbage can decision
making’ which is intuitive, is characterised by muddling through, agenda building, brainstorming and dialectical enquiry. She contrasts it with the traditional management approaches required in an environment, which is relatively stable and consensual. Darwin (2001) identifies the traditional “toolkit” of methods for decision making in a stable environment, including techniques such as SWOT, PEST(EL), five forces analysis, stakeholder analysis. He claims that these methods underplay ‘backstage activity’ including power and politics and identifies the need for approaches that have more resonance to understanding the practice of managers, politicians and consultants as policy makers. Darwin’s (2001) research does not relate to tourism policy making but the methods he associates with linear thinking and stability are commonly recommended for policy making in the tourism literature.

In the tourism literature, Russell & Faulkner (1999) use the edge of chaos concept to understand destination development by identifying the rapid changes (phase shifts), which occur as entrepreneurs respond to new opportunities or threats. They claim these phase shifts are induced by technological innovation and changes in the wider socio-economic environment and natural environment. Their research draws attention away from the activities and actions of planners and policy makers and will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter.

**Positive and negative feedback**

Mitleton Kelly (1998) claims policy and planning systems that are developed within equilibrium frameworks are based on the assumption of negative feedback. Negative feedback is “the process required to produce the dynamics of stability” (Stacey, 2003:33), with the assumption that links between cause and effect are clear-cut.

> Monitoring systems are set up to detect deviation from the planned outcome. Whenever there is a deviation from the specified objective, action is taken to bring the deviation under control, by attempting to reduce the gap between the intended and actual outcome” (1998:15).

Complexity theorists argue that social systems are subject to positive feedback, which means that actions may lead to unpredictable outcomes. Positive feedback is the term
given to the progressive widening of the gap between the required and the actual results.

The discussion around negative and positive feedback highlights how a policy response to a multifaceted problem in a complex environment can be successful at one level and unsuccessful at another. For example a destination that is perceived to offer low quality service standards may adopt a policy to develop a service training programme to improve the skills of its tourism workers. This may result in 100 people being trained and at one level be perceived to be a success. However if those 100 people then use their training to gain better employment in other destinations, or in other sectors, the overall outcome of that policy intervention may make the problems worse at that specific destination. In this case the concept of positive feedback draws attention to the implications of a range of complex interrelationships, movements and interactions of people across the wider environment and to the need to think broadly across geographical and organisational boundaries, and through time.

*The policy landscape*

Complexity theorists consider the nature of the environment and relationships between complex systems and the wider environment. Some complexity theorists describe the environment outside a given system as the *landscape* (Battram, 1999; Blackman, 2001) and claim that its characteristics affect the dynamic and nature of change within any system. Blackman (2001) characterises a rugged landscape as one where autonomous action is stifled and claims that this reduces likelihood of transformative change within complex systems.

The concept of landscape is interesting for policy analysts because policy interventions are always embedded in a larger policy landscape. For example it draws attention to the paradoxical dynamic that has arisen through the implementation of the ‘Third Way’/modernisation agenda with central government attempting to enact radical changes at the local level. These changes have resulted in a LA landscape that is extremely rugged, with increased centralised control (legislative, monitoring and financial) and very limited scope for autonomous action at the local level. However the
'democratic renewal agenda' requires a landscape that is far less rugged, with more scope for local innovation and action.

**Co-evolution**

Waldrop (1992) identifies **co-evolution** as a powerful force for emergence and self organisation in any complex adaptive system. He claims that any given organism's ability to survive depends on the niche it is filling, the other organisms around, the resources it can gather and its past history. Co-evolution is a useful concept when looking at policy systems as it emphasises inter-relationships between entities, power relations and history. Battram (1999) claims that co-evolution gives supports to the idea that agencies change relative to what other agents are doing and claims this *metaphor* is useful for the study of partnerships in the natural and social world. He draws from Kelly (1994) who emphasises the learning that takes place as systems or participants within systems adapt to one another. The concept of co-evolution is interesting for policy analysis as it draws attention to the way policies interact with one another and compete for resources. It also draws attention to the wider organisational setting of policy and can be used to inform thinking about the relationships within and between partnerships which have been tasked with developing and delivering policies.

**Connectivity**

Complexity theory emphasises the importance of relationships between systems and those within systems. A complex system is defined more by relationships than by its constituent parts. Sub systems and individual components of systems have functions or goals, but given the complexity of relationships between components, it is impossible to characterise the system on the whole as having a unified purpose. Relationships of differing strengths between component parts define the internal structure of a system. Lewin (1993) uses the term *connectivity* to express the way systems behaviour relies less on the nature of individual agents than on the quality and quantity of connections between them. In policy analysis connectivity encourages a focus on relationships (Tosey, 2002), communication (Medd, 2001) and conversations (Stacey, 2003)
The application of complexity theory to tourism

Chapter 2 briefly outlined critiques of systems theory drawing from some concepts from complexity theory. This section will consider the application of chaos and complexity theory more generally in the tourism literature. A number of tourism researchers have investigated chaos and complexity theory as a way of understanding tourism. Russell & Faulkner (1999) are critical that tourism research has focussed on "phenomena that exhibit order, linearity and equilibrium" (1999:411) avoiding the more turbulent, complex, and human aspects. Faulkner & Russell (1997), McKercher (1999) Russell & Faulkner (1999) use ideas from complexity and chaos theory to critique models of tourism that simplify phenomena in order to identify key parts and then assume linear relationships between those parts. McKercher (1999) refers to work by Pearce (1989) that assumes it is possible to

"understand how tourism works by dis-aggregating it into its component parts, identifying the relationships and then re-aggregating it" ...and argues, "the whole of tourism is equal to the sum of its parts" (1999:426).

McKercher (1999) evaluates systems models by Mill & Morrison (1985), Gunn (1998), Murphy (1985) and Leiper (1979, 1990) and says each model assumes tourism is organised,

"can be controlled...(actors) function in a formally coordinated manner...tourism is a sum of its constituent parts, and...by understanding how each part works, an understanding of how tourism works as a whole will emerge" (1999:426).

He argues these models conceptualise tourism in a linear, deterministic way and fail to take account of the dynamic nature of tourism. This conceptualisation perceives failures in planning arising from a lack of data and inadequate analysis rather than a function of the inherent complexity and chaos of tourism. Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004), Faulkner & Russell (1997), McKercher (1999) and Russell & Faulkner (1999), criticise existing models for their selectivity and focus on stability or orderly linear change rather than complexity and turbulence in systems.
"The central problem is that tourism researchers schooled in a tradition of linear, specialised, predictable, deterministic, cause-and-effect science, are working in an area of study that is largely nonlinear, integrative, generally unpredictable, qualitative and characterised by causes giving rise to multiple outcomes, quite out of proportion to the initial input" (Farrell & Twining-Ward 2004:277).

Chapter 2 discussed the contribution of complexity theory to the debate about systems. McKercher (1999) claims that whilst tourism models recognise the complex nature of tourism and the inter relatedness of tourism "systems" the majority fail to appreciate the chaotic nature of those systems. He contends that tourism is characterised by a complex range of interactions and that its dynamics are non-linear and unstable. He draws from chaos theory on the basis that it recognises that periods of instability are intrinsic to the operation of, and are essential for change to complex systems. McKercher draws from the work of Lewin (1993) demonstrating that large interactive dynamic systems evolve naturally towards the edge of chaos. The implication of this for tourism is that it can appear to evolve in a stable, predictable and linear manner over long periods of time, until a trigger initiates a period of chaotic upheaval where non-linear relationships dominate. The dominance of 'Newtonian' and rational approaches in tourism means that knowledge is well developed in some selected parts of the tourism system but that there is little knowledge of the relationships and interactions between these parts (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004).

**Contribution of complexity to understanding tourism**

The contribution of complexity theory to tourism is significant but limited. Its significance arises from its role in questioning the rationalism that is dominant in tourism literature. Chaos and complexity theory provide an opportunity for researchers to re-examine the nature of tourism, taking into account the complex interplay between actors or elements that affect the system. In particular chaos theory is used to identify and research the less predictable and controllable elements of tourism. The complexity theory in the tourism literature draws attention to context specificity and the idea that knowledge is local. Faulkner (2003) supports the idea of adopting paradigms according to their utility in specific situations.
"Thus, rather than assuming that the alternative paradigms are mutually exclusive, each should be applied to certain domains of phenomenon within a field, depending on where they prove to be more or less useful" (2003:217).

This raises fundamental questions about the development and use of universal models as a way of researching and understanding change. Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004) suggest a "reconceptualisation of the structure of tourism study" is required to facilitate "integration, transdisciplinarity and the use of nonlinear tools and concepts" (2004:288). However, while Faulkner (2003) suggests that complexity has a role in identifying fundamental limitations of the 'Newtonian' paradigm he claims "that room should be made for a diversification of perspectives" (2003:216) rather than a paradigm shift.

**Limitations of these approaches**

The main limitations arise on the basis that chaos and complexity theory have been applied to a comparatively narrow range of tourism issues by relatively few researchers. These studies are largely underpinned by chaos theory and are predominantly grouped around chaotic events or crises management in tourism (McKercher, 1999; Faulkner & Vikulov, 2001; Miller & Ritchie, 2003; Ritchie et al, 2003) the roles, power and tensions between individuals in the process of destination development (Russell & Faulkner, 1999), and as a way of progressing sustainability research in tourism (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; Miller & Twining Ward, 2005 and Twining-Ward 2002). All of these studies provide interesting insights for research into tourism policy making in the LA context but only Tyler & Dinan (2001a & b) directly discuss tourism policy making in within the context of complexity theory focussing on the roles and power of policy networks.

What has not happened in the tourism literature is an investigation into the complexity of complexity science and the variety of views and interpretations that exist in the complexity literature. The tourism literature does not clearly identify alternative approaches and tourism researchers do not articulate which approach to chaos or complexity they have adopted. A review of the literature indicates that Russell & Faulkner (1999) and Twining-Ward (2002) have adopted biological and ecological definitions of chaos and complexity and their ideas appear to draw from the work of Prigogine & Stengers (1997) and the Brussels Group. There is much less discussion
about the work of the *Sante Fe group* (including Gell Man, 1994 and Waldrop, 1992) and no discussion of the work of policy and organisational theorists. Most studies draw heavily from chaos theory and the ideas developed by the *Brussels School*, rather than complexity theory but there is no explicit discussion about chaos in the context of the wider debates around complexity.

Chaos theory underpins research into both chaos and complexity in tourism and has usually been applied to the turbulent or chaotic parts of tourism systems. An example of this is a model developed by Russell & Faulkner (1999) suggesting polarity between the inclinations of entrepreneurs and planner/policy makers associating the former with intuitive, innovative, experimental inclinations. These inclinations are perceived to be essentially chaotic in nature and amenable to study using chaos theory. The model characterises the policy makers' inclinations as rational, rigid, risk averse and controlling. They are perceived to be a stable part of the tourism system in their role of "establishing a 'Newtonian' regime of equilibrium and linear change" (1999:417). This dichotomous thinking is reductionist in that it overstates the differences between different groups of people and underplays the interactions between the two. It ignores the relevance of complexity theory to policy making by delineating and polarising the behaviours and activities of different people involved in the development process. The study draws attention away from the potential relevance that complexity theory might have to developing understanding of policy making in terms of its complex interactions and communications.

Tourism research has not embraced some of the ideas in the wider policy and organisational literature about whether and how complexity *metaphors* can be applied to human or social phenomena. For example Tsoukas & Hatch (2001) challenge orthodox approaches to complexity on the basis that they exhibit the same reductionist tendencies as the Newtonian, linear models when they identify the common principles underlying different systems. This type of modelling is apparent in the tourism chaos and complexity literature. Examples include McKercher’s (1999) chaos model of tourism that explains tourism in terms of complex interrelationships between nine major elements; the use of the adaptive cycle by Holling & Gunderson (2002) by Farrell & Twining-Ward (2004) and Miller & Twining-Ward (2005) and Russell & Faulkner’s (1999) highly polarised and simplified model to contrast the inclinations of chaos makers and
Tourism researchers have tended to rely on scientific approaches and "traditional" chaos and complexity theory rather than the approaches and ideas being put forward by social scientists and policy analysts. They have not encompassed debates in the wider literature questioning how to apply complexity *metaphors* to social phenomena and how to study complexity taking account of all its complexity.

The application of complexity theory to wider research

Haynes (2001) summarises the attractiveness of the complexity approach as

- "A commitment to be multi-disciplinary, in the broadest sense;"
- Challenging traditional approaches to causality and association;
- Encouraging some new holistic thinking that is more realistic than the previous attempts at holism;
- Permitting policy analysts to honestly face the limits of their discipline, without giving up the search for knowledge and progress" Haynes (2001:1).

The wider policy and organisational literature discussed in this section recognises that complexity is a feature of society and that complexity science has an important role in questioning some of the assumptions that have underpinned traditional analysis. However it goes further than the tourism literature in that it investigates and debates different approaches to complexity theory, drawing from a range of commentaries. The literature also explores the methodological implications of complexity, investigating whether and how complexity *metaphors* can be applied to social systems, and the methods that can be used to research complex phenomena.


"the extreme position in so far as the assumption that research in mathematics and the natural sciences which has generated a paradigm called 'complexity
science' offers a way of understanding the social world and the world of social policy" (Medd, 2001a:1).

A number of researchers including Medd (2001a&b), Shaw (2002) and Stacey (2003) note this position is powerful and predominant in the complexity literature. Complexity science is presented as an alternative way of seeing the world and transforming understanding of social phenomena. This position is underpinned by an assumption that complexity science offers a coherent and ordered body of knowledge that is superior to other positions. The problem with this discourse is that it identifies complexity not as a "way of looking at the world to be compared with other possibilities, but the way of the world. We are not invited to explore possibilities for understanding the world but to see how the world really works" (Medd, 2001a:2).

It is clear in the wider literature that there is not one complexity theory and theorists from a spectrum of parent disciplines are engaged in a debate about whether and how key metaphors from this "science" can be applied to investigate human phenomena. Some have applied these metaphors in a literal way, some have started to develop models based upon complex adaptive systems and others argue that this type of thinking cannot be applied directly to human systems. Recent research into social policy and organisations (Blackman, 2001; Byrne 2001, Fonseca, 2002; Harvey, 2001; Medd, 2001 a&b; Stacey, 2003; Shaw, 2002 and Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001) investigates and questions the assumptions that complexity sciences bring into social enquiry. These researchers note that the underlying complexity concepts or metaphors can be both deterministic and reductionist, limiting learning in much the same way as traditional models about organisations and policy making.

**Methods and methodology**

"The greatest danger for the social sciences in this age of conceptual riches and rising expectations, however, is that we over-literalize or reify metaphors so as to appear to be on an academic par with the physical sciences" (Harvey, 2001:8).
A variety of models and approaches are adopted to research complexity within society, some researchers attempt to directly translate ideas and models to explore complex social phenomena whilst others question whether and how these ideas translate into the social sphere. The next section will explore the limitations to the application of complexity theory, the debates about complexity modelling, and qualitative and quantitative methods that are appropriate to study complex social phenomena.

The implications of human action.

A number of researchers identify the difficulty of using some of the complexity metaphors in the human sphere. Stacey (2003) claims that many researchers reify organisations and conceptualise them as 'things' rather than as 'mental structures' or networks of communication between people. In the same way it can be argued that many tourism policy analysts reify policy, focussing on its tangible manifestations. If policy is re-conceptualised in the manner suggested by Fonseca (2002) Shaw (2002) and Stacey (2003) to focus on the human communications and interactions that shape policy practice then it is appropriate to consider the nature and complexity of human action.

The complexity and unpredictability of human behaviour raises questions about how and whether complex adaptive systems fully encompass human agency and action. Haynes (2001) questions those complex adaptive systems models that assume that humans are generally passive and conditioned by the rules and their environment. He draws attention to human behaviour, claiming that humans are capable of producing new rules and choosing whether to apply them or not. Medd (2001a) asks how complexity can encompass emergence in human systems in particular how it can encompass complex human behaviours that are influenced by factors inside and outside the policy system and are not always bound by the rules within the system. Harvey (2001) questions how the idea of self organisation can be translated into the social world claiming that

"the idea of groups and institutions being 'spontaneously organized', is a half truth that leaves the social sciences vulnerable to charges of reifying the world...Such reification directs attention away from the fact that institutional
reproduction and operation is governed not only by the historical logic of institutional formations, they are equally the product of human agency" (2001:8).

Harvey (2001) contends that in the human sphere it is important to acknowledge that humans are complex so on one hand they are "socially determined, productions of historically situated social structures" (2001:8) but also are "free-agents" who exhibit unpredictable behaviour. The implication of human behaviour is an additional layer of complexity and means the complex adaptive systems modelling used by physicists and natural scientists may not be appropriate for human systems.

Can people model social systems?

Stacey (2003) argues that as participants in interactions in the social world, humans cannot analyse that world in an objective and value free way. Medd (2001a&b) contends that in order to apply complexity metaphors to the social sphere the researcher needs to make assumptions about the policy system, the relevant agents and the way the different elements connect. He demonstrates the subjectivity involved in this process by illustrating three episodes from an ethnographic study into the development and delivery of a social welfare project. The episodes illustrate connections and collaborations between different people from different organisations involved in the development and delivery of the project. Each episode is connected because they all relate to one project, but they are disconnected, because they occur in different times and places with different outcomes, and are enacted through different people with different motivations. He uses the three episodes to illustrate the extent to which the researcher has to make decisions based upon a-prioi assumptions about the system and illustrates that a complexity model of this system "would have to be as complex as the system itself"(2001b:4). Medd says;

"To talk, write or think about policy as a complex system we need to think about how our assumptions make connections between these events such that they are part or not of that system" (2001b:4).

This illustrates the extent to which the connections made by the researcher have implications for what is deemed relevant to the policy and what is studied and highlights
the need for researchers to acknowledge and evaluate their position and likely bias. It also highlights the complexity of the policy process leading to researchers and policy makers needing to exclude information, people and relationships in policy highlighting the relationship between policy making and research and ignorance.

Modelling complexity

The previous sections have reviewed some of the debates in the wider literature questioning whether it is possible to model complex adaptive systems in the human sphere, highlighting the complexity of human action and the inability of researchers to stand outside the systems they are studying. The implication is that straightforward approaches to modelling connections between different elements in the system are likely to be reductionist and deterministic reflecting the personal experiences or understanding of the researcher.

Fonseca (2002), Mitelton Kelly (1998), Shaw (2002), Stacey (2003) and Tsoukas & Hatch (2001) reject model building as a way of seeking to understand complex phenomena in society. They draw attention to the fundamental distinction between human and other complex systems, based on the assumption that humans are able to make choices and as a result their behaviour is complex. They claim that modelling involves simplification of complex phenomena and is based upon the assumption that the researcher can disconnect and stand outside of society in order to research and hypothesise. Fonseca (2002) claims that approaches that embody the idea that complex systems exist as 'objective realities' and that humans can stand outside of a model emphasise the predictable aspects of complex systems.

Batty & Torrens (2001) investigate the implications of complexity on developing predictive models in the context of urban development and change. They highlight the dilemmas in trying to model complexity in the context of infinite variety, unpredictability and ambiguity. They claim that complex models "can only be tested partially" and "cannot be validated" (2001:17) which means they lack the predictive qualities and in some senses are "less believable than traditional models"(2001:20).
Traditional models "get the present right and are then used to predict the future. In contrast complex systems models can never predict the present definitively and thus the focus changes to exploring a variety of presents" (2001:18).

Batty & Torrens (2001) and Medd (2001) highlight the extent to which complex systems models tell a specific story, based upon the assumptions adopted by the researcher. Their assumptions lead them to focus on particular issues and Medd (2001) suggests this limits understanding of the policy process and raises questions about methodology.

**Debates about quantitative methods**

Haynes (2001) argues that complexity has implications for the way in which quantitative methods are used and questions the value of quantitative reductionist research. He uses the example of the Standard Spending Assessment (the mathematical formula used to allocate treasury money to LAs in Britain) and demonstrates the incremental assumptions in developing the formula i.e. "assumptions about the past are projected into the future". He also highlights the possibility of adjusting the formula to present numerous mathematical outcomes to politicians so that they may pick "the most politically acceptable." (2001:8) He claims

"the final outcome in policy terms where government still has to give the recipient organisation considerable discretion in how it allocates the funding" leads to the situation where "specific measurement becomes circumvented in the policy reality" (2001:8).

Haynes (2001) highlights the paradox in government policy in Britain, which in contradiction to its joined up philosophy focuses on micro and reductionist quantification of performance management that ignores wider issues. He contends that quantitative research has a role in complex policy management but that this is more in terms of producing large scale, descriptive accounts and methodological pluralism than in developing micro analysis of programmes. He claims "complexity offers an opportunity to move from reductionist questions to some holism questions" (2001:10) and to move from just analysis to synthesis so that research explores rather than explains social issues.
Debates about qualitative methods

A number of researchers (including Fonseca, 2002; Sanderson, 2001; Shaw, 2002; Stacey, 2003 and Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001) support Haynes (2001) in his contention that complexity requires methods which are more exploratory than explanatory. They challenge the simple importation of complexity concepts into the human realm using conventional systems thinking and suggest that an alternative approach might be to tap complexity as way of investigating the relationships involved in the complex responsive processes in society. They focus on the importance of human interaction and communication in the construction of "every day reality" and develop ideas about reflexivity and understanding through participation. They emphasise the importance of conversations in setting up the constraining themes, norms and values within groups in society.

Stacey (2003) claims that complexity theorising is largely underpinned by "systems thinking" and argues that this approach constrains thinking. He recommends a "process thinking" as an alternative model in order to shift the focus on to the nature of interaction and to focus differently on what we are doing. He contends that process thinking encourages the researcher to think about what is happening in the present as "we iterate our pasts in expectation of our futures" (2003:317) rather than predicting what should happen in the future.

The contribution of the wider literature

The wider literature discusses how concepts developed in complexity theory might be used to develop social research. Medd (2001a&b) and Harvey (2001) draw attention to the pitfalls of a simple or literal translation of complexity metaphors to explain human activities highlighting the complexity of human action. Literal translation has the potential to limit understanding in a similar way to the prescriptive policy-process models that predominate in tourism literature. Medd (2001b) argues that complexity models carry assumptions that affect understanding of policy dynamics. In particular he identifies limitations of traditional or mainstream complexity models in terms of their reductionist and deterministic assumptions. Fonseca (2002) Stacey (2003) and Shaw (2002) echo these concerns and have developed alternative approaches to
understanding and researching complexity in social systems. They have developed research that reflects the importance of communication, conversations and storytelling in organisations supported by narratives as a way of demonstrating relationships and developing knowledge about the dynamics of change in the human sphere.

In the wider literature it is clear that, in its application to human systems, complexity theory should not be applied literally, as a set of rules, methods and models, but should be developed as a way to encourage thought and learning. When applying complexity theory to policy it is necessary to question its assumptions and to think about complex phenomena in complex ways. Byrne (2001) conceptualises complexity as a "frame of reference – a way of understanding what things are like, how they work, and how they might be made to work" (2001:7), rather than a set of methods.

The relevance of complexity to this study

Complexity theory is informed by, and is being debated within many disciplines and is relevant to this study for a number of reasons. The first reason is based upon the inherent intricacies and complexities of tourism planning and policy and is outlined in Chapter 2 in more detail. Hall (2000) claims this is because of the temporal nature of process, the multiplicity of participants and the multiplicity of policy provisions. This is exacerbated by complexity of tourism as a subject area and its multi-disciplinary roots and the development of a diverse body of theory without real theoretical cohesion. Theory development in the field to date has been very dependent on the background of the theorist i.e. discipline, politics, values, educational, interests etc. Theorists interpret the planning "problem" in a different ways and have developed different models reflecting a variety of disciplinary perspectives.

The discussions and debates in the wider literature on complexity theory present a plausible challenge to many assumptions that underpin the literature on tourism planning and policy. In particular they challenge positivism, linear thinking and the notion that policies and plans can predict, control and shape complex environments. Complexity theory draws attention away from the relative order exhibited in the process models that focus on developing written policies and towards the disorder of a complex environment and the more intangible elements of the policy. It draws attention to the context of
tourism policy, which occurs within a complex policy environment and interacts, complements and competes with other policy areas. It highlights the intrinsic relationship between policy research and ignorance and requires a research approach that can encourage the researcher to be both humble in recognising their own limitations and courageous in resisting the orthodoxy to reduce and simplify.

The wider literature on complexity highlights the extent to which policy making is a “soft” intuitive human process rather than a rational scientific process. Human interactions play a key role in the policy process that is typified by continuous communicative interactions between people. Interactions are formal and informal, cross official boundaries, between teams, departments, organisations and often cross boundaries between “work” and "leisure". In tourism policy making interaction and negotiation is wide ranging, including people with different professional and political backgrounds from a range of organisations. In the context of English LAs, tourism policy is less bound by rules and legislation than other service areas and encompasses a broad range of ideas and techniques from a variety of disciplinary approaches to policy.

Complexity theory challenges assumptions about research and analysis raising questions about what we should try to understand and how we should try to understand. Complexity science works on the assumption of non linearity, which implies that knowledge is local and contextual. On this basis, there is debate about the extent to which researchers can develop models that have meaning outside the local context. It implies the rejection of those models that claim to be universal and that are reductionist, simplifying processes and systems in order to understand them. The wider literature highlights that research into social phenomena requires a research methodology that can encompass the inter-relationships, interactions and communications between people involved in developing and delivering policy. The methodological implications of complexity for this study will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

Summary

Complexity theorists come from a multitude of disciplines, each bringing insights to theory development that is framed by their own experience and ontology. This reiteration and re-evaluation of the underpinnings of the theory and its application to the
social world seems to be particularly pertinent when trying to understand complex phenomena that span traditional disciplines. Complexity concepts are the subject of debate and are subject to multiple interpretation. In the same way that it is not possible to identify one tourism policy theory, it is not possible to identify one complexity theory as different approaches to complexity have been developed in different disciplinary fields. The previous chapters have shown the extent that tourism policy and complexity theory are negotiated and open to varied interpretation which means that neither can be "fixed" or clearly defined. This presents a wide range of possibilities in exploring the implications of complexity on tourism policy.

Tourism researchers using chaos and complexity theory have criticised the emphasis of much tourism research on the ordered, and more easily defined aspects of tourism systems (including Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; McKercher, 1999; Russell & Faulkner, 1999; Faulkner & Russell, 1997). These researchers challenge the dominant conceptualisation of tourism policy and systems and have progressed thinking at a conceptual level, however they have not explicitly engaged in discussion about the methodological implications of complexity.

This chapter has considered some key concepts in complexity theory and debates about how they can be applied to social or human systems. Complexity theory questions the stability and equilibrium implicit in many policy process models and provides a basis from which to consider tourism policy in the context of "real world phenomena" taking account of turbulence and disequilibrium, self organisation and co-evolution. The wider complexity literature highlights the importance of communication in policy making. This provides new insights in terms of conceptualising the dynamic between policy and practice and also raises questions about method on the basis that many of these communications are self organising and can not be predicted or modelled in the traditional way. The complexity literature debates the methods for researching complex social phenomena highlighting the need for exploration rather than prediction.
CHAPTER 4 IDENTIFYING THE CONTEXT FOR LA TOURISM POLICY MAKING IN ENGLAND

Introduction

This chapter demonstrates that policy making is context specific and considers the environment within which tourism policy is developed and implemented. It investigates public policy making in England drawing on wider political and policy theory. It considers dominant ideology and current approaches to policy making at the national level and identifies how these national approaches shape approaches to policy making at the regional and local level. Historical analysis of national tourism policy is undertaken in order to identify the characteristics of policies and initiatives, the organisational arrangements and the nature of tourism networks. Then survey and case study material is investigated in order to identify the nature of LA engagement in tourism policy making and service delivery in England.

Public policy is context specific

In the literature on public policy, Schofield (2000) and Hill (1997) contest the idea that there can be one global approach to conceptualise public policy making. They claim that there is considerable variation between approaches adopted by different nation states. Hill (1997) contrasts the British and American policy contexts and links the rational conceptions of policy process within American literature with their written constitution, federalism and the division of legislative and judicial powers. Schofield (2000) identifies the differences in the cultural, political and institutional contexts in the UK, USA and Scandinavia. The implication of contextual differences on the focus and study of policy is illustrated by Hill (1997) who identifies the different concerns of policy analysts in different parts of the world in the 1990s. He claims at this time, British concerns about implications of changes in policy delivery systems were very different to American concerns about failures of Federal programmes. The research by Schofield (2000) and Hill (1997) identify the extent that different contexts lead to different policy concerns and approaches and questions the logic of developing global approaches to analysing policy.

The issue about context specificity is especially relevant to tourism policy. Chapter 2 illustrates the extent to which researchers draw from different disciplines to develop a
multitude of approaches to understand tourism policy and analyse its process, interactions and environment. It is evident that tourism policy is conceptualised and articulated in different ways in different locations on the basis of the political, economic, environmental social and cultural context. Ladkin & Bertramini (2002) draw from research by Tosun (2000) claiming:

"the political economy of tourism suggests that tourism development itself is a reflection of the political economy of the industry and broader historical, economic and political relations among regions, countries and classes. These exert a powerful influence on the overall tourism development process" (2002:90).

However, despite this evidence, much tourism theory is developed from a rational, normative stance and is presented as if it might have universal application. This is challenged by Elliot (1997), Hall & Jenkins (1995), Hall et al (1997) and Hall (2000) who claim this approach lacks attention to the political dimension and fails to take account of the complexity and context specificity of the policy environment. They perceive public policy-making as a political activity that is influenced by wider economic, social, and cultural factors in the policy environment. Their claims support the idea that policy is context specific and challenge the development of universal conceptualisations of the policy process and policy environment.

The notion that tourism policy “is whatever governments choose to do or not to do with respect to tourism” (Hall & Jenkins, 1995 cited in Hall 2000:9) has particular relevance to the study. This is on the basis that tourism is a non-statutory or permissive local policy area and LA’s can choose how (and whether) to engage in developing policy. Tourism policy making occurs in a number of forms and is conceptualised and delivered (or not) in a variety of different places within the organisation of each LA. Local policy making in England depends upon a range of factors including governmental policy at national and regional levels, local political priorities and economic/environmental conditions and relationships. In the absence of a strong lead from national government on how LA’s should engage in tourism they have an unusual degree of freedom to define and develop policies according to their own local political, economic, social and environmental conditions. This leads to a wide variety of approaches to tourism policy making by LA’s as illustrated in surveys by Richards (1991) and Stevenson & Lovatt (2001). This
variety is uncharacteristic of LA policy making in statutory areas that are largely prescribed by national government.

The impact of the non-statutory nature of tourism policy at the local level is illustrated by two studies which considered the activities of Bradford City Council. The first study was by Buckley & Witt (1985) and considered the proactive approach by the LA to developing Bradford as a destination in the 1980s. The second by Hope & Klemm (2001) charted the extent to which tourism policy moved to the margins of policy making when a funding crisis in the early 1990s led the LA to make the decision that it could not afford to fund the promotion of Bradford as a tourism destination. As a result of this decision Bradford abandoned its marketing strategy and closed the tourism unit. In 1998 Bradford Council in partnership with the private sector, and with funding from the EU re-engaged with tourism policy making and developed a new tourism strategy.

"Bradford's experience shows that support for tourism from local government can not be relied upon. This appears to be for two reasons: the lack of statutory obligation to promote tourism and the difficulty in collecting data to prove whether or not tourism contributes to the local economy" (Hope & Klemm, 2001:634).

The Bradford case studies illustrate the extent to which the external political and funding environment affects tourism policy. A number of themes that emerge are similar to or have a resonance with the Leeds experience, in particular the wavering commitment to tourism. Bradford is geographically proximate to Leeds and the majority of interviewees mention the similarities and the historical political and economic rivalries that characterise the relationship between the people and council leadership of each city.

A number of tourism researchers including Burns (2003), Hall (2000), Pforr (2005), Thomas & Thomas (1998) Twining-Ward (2002) have developed studies that recognise the influence of an array of contextual factors on tourism policy making. These studies consider the context within which plans are developed including political environment, (Burns 2003), the institutional/organisational structures (Dredge & Jenkins, 2003; Treuren & Lane, 2003) the networks and relationships between people in the process (Tyler & Dinan, 2001a&b; Pforr, 2005). These approaches highlight the extent to which
specific environments generate a variety of different approaches to tourism policy making.

The context of the study

This section will explore the influence of political ideology on public service provision and policy making by LA’s in Britain. It will consider the impacts of ‘neo-liberalism’ and ‘third way ideology’ on LA activities, focussing upon the modernisation agenda since 1997 and governance since 1979.

Politics and ideology

Since the 1970s there has been considerable debate about the role and effectiveness of the state. There have been particular concerns that traditional local government structures are not well suited to the policy challenges in the late twentieth and early twenty first century (Hambleton, 1995). In 1979 the ‘New Right’ Thatcher government was elected, with commitment to neo-liberalism and an advocacy of market systems. During the 1980s the ‘New Right’ developed a raft of policy initiatives,

“To inculcate dramatic value shifts at the lower level (in LA’s) through institutional changes particularly directed at changing incentive structures” (Hill 1997:383).

One feature of these initiatives is that they were developed in rapid succession and had the effect of centralising power at the national level. The ‘New Right’ shifted the political agenda and by the late 1990s there was degree of political consensus with New Labour and the Conservatives broadly agreeing on the need for reform of the public sector (Giddens 1998, 2001). Hill (1997) refers to this as “cultural revolution” with centrally induced change producing unpredictable consequences and the centre increasingly monitoring and controlling the activities of local government.

During the 1990s the Labour party adopted ‘third way’ ideology as a response to the neo-liberalist approaches. This has underpinned the modernisation agenda and has led to reforms of public service structures and functions in an attempt to make them more open and customer oriented. Of particular relevance to this study are the changes to
local government and the growing importance of the regions in terms of policy development and delivery. These have been underpinned by the idea that

"the state should not row, but steer: not so much control, as challenge.' The quality of public services must be improved and the performance of government monitored" (Giddens 1998:6).

**Modernisation**

Third way ideology has been articulated within New Labour's modernisation agenda since 1997 and in this section specific attention is given to the implications of that agenda for LA policy making. The modernisation agenda reflects a number of changes in the political environment including broader agreement between political parties and the electorate, that public spending should be constrained and that individuals had some responsibility to provide for themselves. The modernisation agenda has been influenced by changes in the global economy and social changes such as improving health, changing leisure/job opportunities, changing communication channels (influenced by new technology) and changes in social values. The modernisation agenda is underpinned by a view that people have become cynical about public services and want more say in decisions about local services and local democracy (Giddens, 1998, 2001; Parston & Timmins, 1998).

The modernisation agenda calls for

- better integration of regional and local services, using the rhetoric of 'joined-up' thinking and policy making;
- 'democratic renewal' which includes a redefinition of the relationship of local government and the public and the adoption of a more participatory model;
- changes to vest the executive function of local government in a political executive rather than whole council;
- curbs on local government spending and
- "a less ideological predisposition in favour of municipal provision" and more collaboration with the private sector (Midwinter 2001:312).
There are a number of criticisms of the reforms to the structure of local government. Midwinter (2001) claims that they are overly prescriptive and that "executive style" management has centralised power within LAs and is likely to lead to it being unaccountable and undemocratic. Developments associated with modernisation have been perceived to undermine the stability of the LA policy environment and have led to a move away from the notion that uniformity of service provision is a way of achieving equity and fairness. Modernisation has been characterised by the emergence of complex and widespread regulatory activity since 1997. The modernisation agenda has become synonymous with political and managerial reforms that are focussed on partnership and joint responsibility in many areas of social provision. It has led to the development of new organisational structures that are designed to be flexible, less hierarchical and less tied to traditional departments or service areas.

**Governance**

It is useful to investigate the literature on 'governance' as it provides a context for the development of the modernisation agenda. Stoker & Wilson (2004) claim the shift from local government to local governance began in Britain in 1979 in response to concerns about the effectiveness of the state in delivering services and policies within a rapidly changing and complex environment. Governance is characterised by changing relations between the public and private sector, the national state and international bodies, localities and regional bodies (Richards & Smith, 2002). At the LA level governance has impacted on policy making by dramatically altering the arena in which policy making takes place. The term governance is broader than government and draws attention to the changing role of government and the broader structures, institutions and processes of policy. Research into governance considers the plethora of agencies and power arrangements associated with developing and implementing public policies. (Midwinter, 2001; O'Toole, 2000). Richards & Smith (2002) say governance highlights,

"...the changing nature of the policy process in recent decades. In particular, it sensitises us to the ever increasing variety of terrains and actors involved in the making of public policy" (2002:269).
Researchers into governance recognise the context of policy making within LA’s including the “complex and often overlapping set of local political arrangements” (Stoker & Wilson 2004:2) with policies being developed and delivered by partnerships organisations comprising a mix of public, private and voluntary organisations. The emphasis on democratic renewal has led to new political structures designed to include a wider range of people in decision making and new initiatives of measuring and monitoring the outcomes of policy with the aim that LA’s become more accountable to their stakeholders (Stoker & Wilson 2004). Governance has led to a changing approach to delivering services, moving away from principles of universality (and service delivery prioritised by need) towards selection and performance as a criteria for funding i.e. the best bid rather than the most need (Stoker, 2002).

The implications of political changes on the context of LA policy making

The previous section demonstrates that ‘third way’ ideology underlies the current Government’s modernising agenda for public services. The modernisation agenda formalises and progresses changes that were already happening within the policy environment and were articulated under the heading of governance. The changes outlined above mean that LA tourism policy is taking place in a context that is turbulent and in the process of rapid and fundamental change. The local policy environment has been characterised by a raft of new initiatives and “a variety of devices to try to control the behaviour of implementers” (Hill 1997 a:383). In this section the implications of these changes will be investigated on LA policy making generally and then specifically in relation to tourism policy making.

Complexity and change

Davis & Martin (2002) and Richards & Smith (2002) argue that the increasing complexity of organisational relationships around the delivery of local policies have fragmented the policy making process and have led to problems of policy coherence. The local policy arena has been identified as

“an increasing disaggregated local arena characterised by a complex web of cross-cutting and hierarchically arranged relationships” with local government
characterised as a single element in an increasingly complex network of multi
level governance" (Lowndes, 2002a; cited in Stoker 2004:4).

There are tensions between ‘third way’ ideology, governance and the modernisation
agenda. The rhetoric of modernisation implies that the state should be moving away
from direct control of services and towards coordination. However Richards & Smith
(2002) claim that the fragmentation associated with governance has led the Labour
government, post 1997, to introduce centralised control mechanisms and to reimpose its
power over LA’s. The increasingly centralised control from central government during the
past nine years has been characterised by a plethora of initiatives to measure and
standardise policy provision at the local level. Bowerman & Ball (2000) identify the main
tension between the modernising agenda and third way ideology arising from the former
being grounded in regulation and control over local government by the centre and the
latter attempting to develop more local democracy through an open consultative and
collaborative style. Leach (2004) claims the increased regulation associated with
modernisation has decreased the capacity of LA’s to deliver truly local services to the
local electorate. He claims local democratic process has been eroded by

“the increased fragmentation of local service responsibilities among a range of
agencies; and the limitations on local choice developed through a process of
cumulative centralisation” (Leach 2004:86).

Leach (2004) claims complex arrangements for service delivery and more centralised
control have led to a decline in the importance of local democracy by weakening the link
between local party manifestos and local service provision. This aspect of the
modernisation agenda appears to conflict with ‘democratic renewal’ and has
exacerbated apathy and disengagement from the local electoral process. Turnout at
local elections declined to 28.8% in 1998 from 41.5% in 1994 (OPDM, 2002) and a
number of research projects and initiatives have been introduced over the past eight
years to encourage participation (DETR, 2000; OPDM,2002).

The organisational changes introduced to modernise local government have impacted
on the relationships between executive and non-executive councillors, between
councillors and officers, and between the LA and community and business interests.
Gains (2004) refers to the implications of new evaluation measures, local strategic partnerships and other "joined up" initiatives under the democratic renewal agenda. She claims that these have changed the relationship between different people involved in policy making, highlighting the increasingly varied nature of power relationships in local policy making, the complexity and the dynamic nature of those local power relations.

With the exception of Burns (2003) and Thomas & Thomas (1998) there has been little discussion about ideology or the impacts of governance and modernisation in the tourism literature. In the wider literature on policy, ideology and politics in Britain (including Gamble, 2003, Giddens 1998, 2000, 2001; John, 1998; Parston & Timmins,1998; Richards & Smith, 2002; Stoker & Wilson, 2004) there is an absence of any explicit discussion about tourism. However the changes outlined above are relevant to local authority tourism policy making as they highlight a number of possibilities. They are as follows:

- tourism is likely to be developed and delivered by a number of organisations in partnership;
- tourism services may not be provided directly by the Council;
- tourism services may have been 'joined-up' with other service areas in the Council;
- there is likely to be public apathy about tourism services which is related to wider disengagement with the local democratic process; and
- tourism services are delivered in the context of change in terms of organisational structures and approaches to developing policy.

**The rise of the regional agenda**

Another characteristic of the modernisation agenda and governance has been the rise of the regions as political actors. Regional policy making has been facilitated by Regional Development Agencies (RDAs), Regional Assemblies and Government Offices (GOs). The most relevant to this study are RDAs, which were developed in 1999 as a key instrument of economic policy to tackle regional inequality. RDAs are led by boards which are appointed by the Secretary of State, are "business led" and draw together some functions of GOs and existing regional investment bodies. Their strength and
status has increased since 1999, which is evidenced by increase in resources and greater financial autonomy through "single pot" allocations in 2001 and the growing importance of regional economic strategies. Tomaney (2004) claims the importance of the regional agenda has fluctuated as a result of tensions between regional and national development interests. Government has continued to encourage developments in London and the South East to support national interests and image. Also the lack of electoral support for regionally elected assemblies in the referendum in the North East in 2004 appears to have moved some aspects of regional policy down the political agenda.

The RDA's are particularly important to the case study for two reasons, firstly the strategic leadership for tourism was devolved to the RDA's in 2003 and secondly the expenditure and political profile of RDA's is higher in the North of England than in the South, reflecting their objective to reduce regional inequality. This means regional policy is increasingly important in setting the context for LA policy development and implementation. RDA structures and policies are emerging and developing at present and there is little material to evaluate their processes and the effectiveness of policy. The policies and processes within Yorkshire Forward (YF), the RDA covering the Yorkshire and Humber Region, will be considered in more detail in Chapter 6 when the context of the case study is investigated.

The information discussed above demonstrates that the context within which LA's make and deliver policies is characterised by turbulence and change. National governments have sought to develop a modern state at the local level by developing new structures and approaches. The outcome of these approaches has been an increase in centralised regulatory control, and this combined with the regionalisation of some policy functions has led to a situation where local policy discretion has been significantly reduced. Policy approaches at the local level are characterised by complex and fragmented organisational structures and a plethora of policy initiatives. Despite the increase in regulation and measurement from the centre, the complexity of the environment means that it is more difficult for the local political leadership to be held to account for a failure in policy. The complexity of organisational arrangements and partnerships around policy development and delivery mean that it is difficult to attribute culpability if things go wrong.
Historical analysis of tourism policy making by National Government

Historical analysis has been undertaken to identify the policies and initiatives by national government with a focus on those that apply to England and the structures created to develop and implement tourism policy. The decision to focus on England reflects the specific context of tourism policy making and service delivery, with the decision in 1969 to deliver policy through three separate organisations covering England, Wales and Scotland and devolution of government functions to Scottish and Welsh Assemblies in 1997. The following section will briefly document approaches to tourism planning in England since 1977, reflecting the period that LCC has been involved in tourism policy and service provision. Reference will be made to Getz's traditions (identified in Chapter 2) as a way of understanding how the approach in England relates to wider academic disciplines.

1977 – 1979 Labour Government under Callaghan

LCC became interested in tourism in 1977, in the context of economic recession and restructuring. In the 1970s, the structure of the national economy changed rapidly with a decline in traditional primary industries such as coal mining, textiles and steel, and growth in the service sector. These structural changes coupled with a fuel crisis in 1974, led to economic recession and policies that focussed on limiting the effects of industrial decline and regenerating the economy.

In 1977 there was already an organisational framework to guide and shape provision of tourist services, headed by the British Tourist Authority (BTA) with 3 national tourist boards in England, Scotland and Wales. These tourist boards had a development function, with powers to guide and shape the provision and improvement of tourism facilities by providing financial assistance through the Tourist Projects Scheme. Tourism was perceived in terms of its economic importance and Ministerial Guidelines in 1974 highlighted its role in terms of the balance of payments and as an aid to promoting regional development. The land use planning system did not specifically relate to tourism but offered a means to formulate tourism policy, influence the rate of new tourist development and deal with negative impacts of tourism (Heeley,1981). The only specific initiative introduced between 1977-9 was Tourism Growth Points (TGP), designed to
spread tourism development away from London. TGP required an integrated series of tourism development proposals to be drawn up and were supported by Tourism Development Grants and private sector funds (Heeley, 1981). All TGP’s were in areas with an historical association with tourism, and they are unlikely to have spurred the decision for LCC to engage in tourism activities.

The late 1970s were characterised by predominantly economic approaches to tourism which is evident from the economic policy and development incentives outlined above. There is some evidence of boosterism, with government policy focussed on developing tourism and on promoting and advertising through the BTA to achieve growth. There is little evidence of Getz’s spatial tradition as new land use plans were not specifically required to consider tourism land uses and many areas failed to include this permissive area of policy within their remit. When the LCC made the decision to engage in tourism there was fairly scant advice or encouragement from national government. However, there was some discussion about the role of tourism in inner city regeneration, which is likely to have influenced their decision (PCL, 1990).

1979-1990 Thatcherism and the “new right”

In 1979 the Conservative Government led by Margaret Thatcher was elected with a strong ideological commitment to neo-liberalism, to ‘rolling back the frontiers of the state’ and cutting public expenditure. The political agenda focussed on freeing up constraints on private enterprise by cutting state interference. The policy initiatives arising from this agenda were focussed on deregulation, partnership and privatisation and aimed to achieve less intervention by the state and more reliance on the market to resolve economic problems (Thornley, 1986; Veal, 2002).

Central government provided guidance on tourism in Circular 13/79 but this was brief, broadly framed and did not provide a statutory commitment to provide services at the local level. In 1985 Pleasure, Leisure and Jobs was published by the Cabinet Office and emphasised the employment creation potential of tourism. This led to relocation of tourism from Department of Trade to Department of Employment and an increased focus on job creation (Davidson & Maitland, 1997, Tyler & Dinan, 2001a). During the 1980s the commitment to policy delivery via the ETB declined and periodic ministerial reviews
required the ETB to devolve more activity and funds to Regional Tourist Boards (RTBs). The central ETB organisation was reduced and England-wide domestic marketing campaigns declined. In 1988 ETBs power to award investment incentives was suspended on the basis that tourism was now mature and no longer needed government support (Davidson & Maitland, 1997; Jeffreys, 2001).

In the 1980s tourism was recognised as an appropriate activity to regenerate cities and tourism projects were funded as a part of larger urban regeneration initiatives. *Tourism and the Inner City* (1979), identified the importance of tourism projects in inner city regeneration and led to the creation of *Local Tourism Partnership Initiatives* in 1982, which established partnerships between the public and private sectors. In 1984 *Tourism Development Action Programme* (TDAP) was created to develop integrative approaches to tourism policy making with a focus on partnerships and urban regeneration. Twenty TDAP’s were set up by ETB between 1984 and 1990, including one in Leeds. The significance of tourism as a means of regenerating inner cities was enhanced by the decision by the Department of the Environment (DOE) to identify tourism as a separate Urban Programme expenditure category in 1985/6. In 1988 *Action for Cities* highlighted the potential of tourism projects as a means to achieve urban regeneration and asserted government commitment to the development of further tourism projects (Davidson & Maitland, 1997; ETB, 1979 and PCL, 1990).

The 1980s were characterised by Getz’s economic tradition. Tourism was recognised as a means of economic regeneration and tourism projects were funded and developed within deprived inner city areas. Some projects and initiatives developed during the 1980s show characteristics of the boosterism tradition (in particular Urban Development Corporation projects such as the Armouries and Tetley Brewery Wharf in Leeds). However many of these projects were typified by multi-agency working and required new approaches to working which were integrative and perhaps demonstrated some of the ideas which form the foundation of the sustainable tradition. During this stage tourism projects were increasingly perceived to have a role in wider projects focussed on inner city economic regeneration. The role of the ETB in tourism policy making declined during this period as its activities and funds were devolved to the regions. This occurred in the context of governance with moves being made to integrate tourism into wider policy making processes.
In 1990, John Major was elected on a platform that promised a return to a more traditional style of conservatism (Gamble 2003). His leadership was characterised by a focus on individual rights in respect of state activity through the *Citizens Charter* (1991), increasing participation in partnership initiatives, and an increased interest in the environment following the publication of *This Common Inheritance* in 1990. During this period, a number of documents were published to encourage the integration of environmental concerns into a number of policy areas including tourism. *Sustainable Development – The U.K. Strategy* reviewed the state of the environment and highlighted changes that may be required in different sectors. This strategy covered leisure, energy, transport, and waste, all of which impact on the tourism industry but did not directly cover tourism. Further guidance on tourism and sustainability was provided through *Tourism and the Environment: Maintaining the Balance* (1991), *Principles of Sustainable Tourism* (1995) and *Sustainable Rural Tourism* (1995). In 1992, the first national *Planning Policy Guidance note* (PPG) specifically for tourism, PPG 21, was published. It emphasised the objective to achieve sustainable development that served the interests of economic growth and the conservation of the environment. PPG 21 identified tourism as a key strategic topic that should be dealt with in structure plans and specifically encouraged local government to use tourism as an element in urban regeneration (DOE, 1992).

In the 1990s, the role of ETB continued to be diminished as government policy devolved marketing funds and initiatives to RTB’s. Tourism moved to the newly formed Department of National Heritage (DNH) in 1993 and in 1994 DNH announced a programme of action for tourism. From 1995, it published a series of reports under the heading of *Tourism – Competing with the Best*. These documents were not a comprehensive strategy but started the process of identifying key issues for the industry and developing a programme of policy development. A national tourism strategy, *Success Through Partnership: A Strategy for Tourism – Competing with the Best*, was published in 1997 (Davidson & Maitland, 1997; Jeffries, 2001; Tyler & Dinan 2001a).

During this period, economic approaches continued to dominate tourism policy making. Whilst there was some interest in sustainability, Tyler & Dinan (2001a) identify two
factors that weakened the impact of sustainability initiatives in tourism. The first arose because guidance on tourism and sustainability were produced by “officers of government agencies, rather than the government departments” (2001a:223). The second arose as a result of the creation of the Tourism Advisory Forum (TAF) in 1995, comprising members of the industry and relevant public agencies which led to “a policy shift towards employment, competitiveness and quality, and a shift away from the sustainability and environmental management emphasis of previous reports” (2001a:223). They claim that policy was reoriented to address economic concerns when private sector interests became involved in the policy process through the development of the TAF.

1997-2006 Blair and New Labour

Labour was elected in 1997 led by Tony Blair, with a commitment to “third-way” ideology (Giddens 1998, 2001) and a holistic approach to policy making through its modernisation agenda. This agenda attempted to improve local decision making structures, facilitate integrated policy development, improve the quality of policy by involving stakeholders in the process and improve evaluation (Parston & Timmins, 1998).

In 1998 the Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) took over responsibility for Tourism and in the same year published a short document called Tomorrow's Tourism. This document set out targets and objectives for tourism and provided the basis of the first tourism strategy for Britain. A more detailed version of Tomorrow's Tourism – A Growth Industry for the Next Millennium was published in 1999 including action points on sustainability, marketing and promotion, technology, the image of the industry, strategic leadership and regeneration of traditional resorts and regions. This strategy sought to put the Government's broader political agenda into the tourism context, bringing in regionalisation and developing an economic definition of sustainability based upon wise growth (Tyler & Dinan, 2001a). Tomorrow's Tourism Today (TTT, 2004) builds on the previous strategies, emphasising collaborative policy making, the role of tourism in national and regional economic development and states the ambition to give “greater recognition and support to LAs and other local organisations supporting tourism” (2004:12). The links between TTT and policy development in Leeds will be explored in more depth in Chapters 6 and 7.
Since 1997 there have been a number of changes in the agencies that deliver tourism policy and undertake tourism marketing for Central Government. In 1999 ETB was reorganised and renamed English Tourism Council (ETC) and many of their powers were devolved to the regions. The BTA’s profile was raised after the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in 2000 and the terrorist attacks on September 11 2001 and the BTA received additional funding for marketing campaigns. In October 2002 Government announced that the ETC and BTA would be merged to combine resources and that the strategic responsibility for developing tourism policy was to be devolved to the regions. A new organisation Visit Britain was set up to coordinate overseas marketing in 2003.

In the current phase, tourism policy is devolved to the regions and is delivered by RDA’s. At the regional level the link between tourism policy and land use planning is weakened and is illustrated by changes to PPG11 Regional Planning (OPDM, 2000). This required regional planning guidance to include tourism and RDAs to work with LPA to identify need and capacity for tourism development. This is replaced by Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 11 (OPDM, 2004) which appears to have significantly downgraded the role of tourism in regional spatial strategies. PPS11 outlines 17 policy topics for the new Regional Policy Statements (RPS), but tourism is not identified as a specific policy topic. Since 2003 the strategic leadership of tourism and the development of a coherent marketing agenda have been devolved to the RDA’s with the RTB role diminished to the delivery of policies and strategies. Changes to national land use policy led to the decision to abandon PPG21. Together with the changes outlined in PPS 11 this had the effect of separating tourism and land use planning policy and strengthening its links with economic policy.

This phase has been characterised by attempts to increase the involvement of stakeholders in discussions about policy and implementation. Trade and business interests have become increasing involved in the process through the Annual Tourism Summit to discuss strategy development and the creation of the Tourism Alliance (TA) 2001 to represent the industry and contribute to tourism policy. Tyler & Dinan (2001a) claim the growth in the importance of the voice of private sector industry interests has led to government guidance moving away from some of the environmental concerns expressed in the early 1990s and towards an economic definition of sustainability and
economic approach. This has been exacerbated because the public have remained largely apathetic and unaware of tourism policy making and have not become involved in the policy process. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 7 and 8.

The characteristics of tourism policy at the national level

The main characteristics of tourism policy at the national level are the predominance of economic approaches, continued low status, organisational change and the growth of partnerships with the private sector. Historic analysis of tourism policy by national government in Britain indicates that the economic tradition has been dominant since the 1970s and that tourism has been perceived in terms of its potential to generate employment and its regeneration potential. Tourism initiatives have been linked to economic restructuring, regional development and inner city regeneration. This is supported in the literature (Williams & Shaw, 1998; Davidson & Maitland, 1997) who claim tourism policy has been developed with an economic rationale focussing on job creation and restructuring.

Despite the frequent links between land use planning theory and tourism planning theory (Costa, 2001; Getz, 1986; Gunn, 2002; Hall, 1995; Hall et al, 1997; Hall, 2000) it is difficult to find any evidence to suggest that land use planning has ever been dominant in the development of tourism policies in Britain. More specifically there is little evidence of the rational physical/spatial planning tradition identified by Getz in 1987 (1999, 2001) in tourism policy making. Advice from Central Government about planning for tourism has been scant (Circular 13/79, PPG 21) and not supported by a mandatory requirement at the local level. The link between spatial planning and tourism policy making has been weakened in the past three years by the decision not to update PPG21 and failure to include tourism as one of the 17 topic areas in PPS11. Some examples of boosterism are evident, particularly in the planning and development of flagship projects and larger events, such as the Dome and the London Olympics. The sustainable and community traditions are increasingly popular in the literature and rhetoric of policy making, and have been articulated in advisory documents in Britain, particularly during the 1990's.

Tourism has a low status in public policy making in England, which is evidenced by the scant legislative framework for the development and delivery of policies and services. It
has remained a "sub" departmental area during the past 30 years and is still seen as an adjunct of other policy areas. The development and delivery of tourism policy has been characterised by the reliance on sub state agencies, such as ETB/C, BTA, RTB's and the RDA's. The organisational framework for tourism policy delivery is fragmented and has been subject to frequent changes. Tyler & Dinan (2001a) identify the extent of this fragmentation at the national level with responsibility for tourism split between nine departments. The organisational responsibilities for tourism have also been characterised by frequent changes and the BTA has been responsible to Department of Trade, Department of Employment, the DNH and the DCMS.

Organisational changes have been profound and far-reaching, particularly in the past seven years, due to developments in the regional agenda and the decision that tourism is a regional policy matter and will be delivered by the RDA's. Also there have been frequent changes to the agencies delivering tourism policy at national level which include the abolition of the ETB in 1999, replacing it with a streamlined ETC, and the merger of the ETC and the BTA and the creation of Visit Britain 2003. The implications of the organisational changes have been a "loss of corporate memory" and "corporate knowledge" (Tyler & Dinan 2001a:225) about tourism which has exacerbated the flux and uncertainty about the nature and purpose of tourism policy making. Another characteristic has been growth of partnership working to develop and deliver tourism policies. This has led to the rising importance of private sector interests in tourism policy making and has led to new and diverse power relationships. These are complex and reflect the diverse and fragmented nature of the industry. Tyler & Dinan (2001a) claim the limited nature of public engagement in tourism policy is likely to result in emerging priorities reflecting the interests of the private sector, rather than wider interests.

**Tourism policy at the local level in England**

LAs can play an important role in tourism, by making and implementing policies to promote and develop tourism and coordinating the activities of stakeholders in their areas. Case study material by Buckley & Witt, (1985,1989) and Thomas & Thomas (1998) identifies proactive approaches to tourism policy making by LAs in Britain in the 1980's and 1990's. TTT (2004) states
Local authorities continue to perform vital functions in supporting the tourism industry – not least, because of their statutory duties, and their wider responsibilities for local infrastructure, economic development and sense of place. Local authorities are well placed to perform the essential function of coordinating all aspects of tourism at local level, working in partnership with businesses and other interests, including RDA’s and their delivery partners" (DCMS, 2004:14).

However recent research indicates that LA roles vary widely (Richards, 1991; Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001; Stevenson, 2002) and are influenced by broader policies relating to the finance and arrangement of LA activities (Hope & Klemm, 2001; Thomas & Thomas, 1998). LAs are required by law to provide a wide range of services including welfare, cultural, land use planning and education services but there is no requirement to provide tourism services. Tourism services are non-statutory and advice from national government is broadly framed which means LAs have considerable discretion in developing and delivering policy. Tourism policy at the local level in England is characterised by widely differing organisational arrangements, interpretations, research and resourcing. Survey material by Richards (1991) and Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) indicate that LAs are involved in a broad range of tourism activities. These include direct activities such as promotion, the provision of visitor information, policy making, visitor and attraction management and development, creation of destination based fora and private/public partnerships. Indirect activities include infrastructure and service provision that impacts upon visitors and their overall experience.

This section considers tourism policy making by LAs in England and identifies the extent to which tourism policy making is subject to local interpretation and draws from research by Buckley & Witt (1985), Hope & Klemm (2001), Richards (1991), Stevenson & Lovatt (2001), Stevenson (2002) and Thomas & Thomas (1998).

The organisation of the tourism policy service

Tourism does not fit easily within the traditional organisational structures in English LA’s because tourism services span different service areas. Wider changes resulting from the modernisation agenda have attempted to change in the way LA’s manage, organise
and deliver services, 'join-up' policy making and facilitate better communication across traditional departments. The RELAT survey indicates the extent of this change with the majority of LA's reporting that they were in the process of reorganisation. Tourism officers consider that these changes might have a positive impact, integrating tourism into the mainstream policy arena (Stevenson & Lovatt 2001, Stevenson, 2002).

Figure 1 Responsibility for Tourism
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Source: Stevenson & Lovatt (2001)

The RELAT survey indicates LA tourism activities are usually delivered under the umbrella of a broader service function. They are increasingly located in executive or strategic management service areas at the centre of the LA organisation (identified in Figure 1 as strategic/executive/ resources/management) or within multifunctional service areas that span traditional service boundaries. Where tourism services are linked to one service area they are increasingly located with economic development/regeneration service areas decreasingly in leisure and recreation and planning services (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001).

The organisational arrangements identified in Figure 1 represent the diversity of ways in which tourism is perceived by LA's, with some identifying tourism with economic
regeneration and development, some identifying tourism having a role in the strategic centre and some linking it to wider cultural, environmental and education services. On one hand this can be seen as a result of LA's recognising the wider economic, environmental and social implications of tourism activity (Stevenson 2002). Alternatively it may just highlight the continued uncertainty and confusion about what tourism policy is and where it fits with other service areas.

The RELAT survey indicates that a growing number of tourism activities are carried out by agencies or through partnership arrangements with other governmental and non-governmental organisations. The type of service offered in partnership with other organisations includes promotional campaigns, marketing and research, developing a tourism product, improving service quality and event organisation. LA's are less likely to be sole or direct provider tourism of services but have a role in organising, and facilitating tourism partnerships and in participating in broader based regeneration partnerships (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001).

**Tourism policy**

The proportion of authorities with tourism policy increased between 1991 and 2000 from 74% to 80%. A further 8% of LA's surveyed in 2000 stated that they were in the process of adopting a written tourism policy (Stevenson 2002). Policy was most frequently articulated in a tourism strategy, however in many cases tourism policy was also articulated within other plans and strategies covering economic development, land use, leisure visitor management, culture, heritage, and service delivery.

In the RELAT survey LA's, with a written tourism policy, were asked to identify their five major objectives in order of importance. The most important objective was the promotion and marketing of the area, which reflects developments in national policy. Sustainability and economic development/regeneration emerged as new policy objectives since the Richards Survey (1991) indicating a broader conceptualisation of tourism. Sustainability was ranked as the second highest priority indicating that tourism activities and services were considered in a much broader policy context and took account of wider environmental, economic and social considerations. Economic development/regeneration was ranked as the fourth highest priority and included
maximising economic benefit from tourism, widening and strengthening the economic base, physical and economic regeneration and the support of rural communities and economies (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001).

Figure 2: Tourism Policy, priorities of LA's in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion/marketing of area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Product development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic development/regeneration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve quality of attractions/product</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage/sustain partnerships</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase visitor spend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide employment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase visitor numbers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carry out research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Visitor management)

Source: Stevenson & Lovatt (2001)

Characteristics of tourism policy

Changing organisational relationships and structures

Initiatives associated with modernisation and governance would appear to enhance LA's ability to make policy in "cross-cutting" and emerging policy areas like tourism by developing new structures and a stronger executive. However these changes have been accompanied by curbs in spending and increasingly centralised control of statutory service standards which has limited local power and discretion (Richards & Smith, 2000; Leach, 2004). As a result governance and modernisation do not appear to have a major impact on tourism services which continue to be non statutory, minimally funded and delivered by individuals or small teams who work on the margins of a larger service area (Stevenson, 2002; Thomas & Thomas, 1998).

The RELAT survey shows that LA's are increasingly working in partnerships with other organisations to carry out tourism activities. Partnership activities include marketing and promotion, developing tourism products, event organisation and research. LAs reported strong communication links with the private sector and with RTBs (Stevenson & Lovatt,
Tyler & Dinan (2001b) contend that one of the implications of the growth of partnership working is that "policy is not pre-ordained, but bargained and negotiated for by interested parties" (2001:212). Partnership working has changed the balance of power between private and public sector policy makers and has led to "a huge range of non predictable, evolving relationships" (2001:211) which are dynamic, fluid and complex.

LA's have adopted executive style leadership and have re-organised departmental structures with the intention of "joining-up" or integrating policy making across traditional functional boundaries. These organisational changes could lead to an increased awareness of the nature and potential benefits of tourism activities across a whole range of service areas. In the RELAT survey tourism officers contend that tourism could emerge as an "inter-connector" between different traditional service functions in policy making and implementation. However despite this potential there is little evidence to show that tourism policy has become a part of mainstream policy making such as economic development and regeneration policy.

Changing priorities

The RELAT survey indicated that there was emerging consensus by tourism officers, that tourism activities have a wider role in economic and physical regeneration than was reported in 1991. Emerging tourism objectives such as sustainability and economic development and regeneration indicate that there is an increased awareness of the potential impacts of tourism activities across a whole range of service areas. The second most commonly cited policy objective was sustainability and it might be surmised that LA tourism policies consider the relationship between tourism and the wider environment and focus on balancing the needs of the visitor, the local economy, the environment and the host community. However, whilst tourism objectives reflect broader issues and impacts, the survey indicates that tourism research is largely focused on traditional tourism objectives such as tourism promotion and product development. LA's do not appear to be undertaking tourism research to support the broader objectives of their tourism policy or to investigate the wider economic, environmental and social impacts of tourism. This presents a contradiction, as the low
levels of research are not consistent with the high priority of policy development in these areas (Stevenson 2002).

**Marginality**

In the wider literature on modernisation, governance and ideology there is no explicit discussion about tourism policy making (including Gamble, 2003, Giddens, 1998, 1999, 2001; John 1998, Parston & Timmins, 1998; Richards & Smith, 2002; Stoker & Wilson, 2004). This highlights the marginality of tourism policy making, which is exacerbated by the non-statutory nature of the service, the difficulties in defining and measuring tourism impacts and the contradictions tourism service provision presents in terms of the local democratic process i.e. providing services for people who do not live in the area, do not vote and do not directly contribute to the cost of the service.

It is clear from research by Thomas & Thomas (1998), Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) Tyler & Dinan (2001) and Stevenson (2002) that tourism policy making occurs on the margins of mainstream activity and is characterised by low budgets and minimal research. Stevenson (2002) highlights the marginality of tourism service delivery by illustrating the minimal budgets that are available to deliver tourism services. She indicates that fifteen percent of responding authorities deliver services with operational budgets of less than £10,000 per annum and twenty seven percent do not employ full time dedicated tourism staff. The notion that tourism is a marginal activity is supported by research by Thomas & Thomas (1998) who consider the impact of the changes associated with governance on tourism policy making in three locations in Britain and claim that;

"organisational inertia and vested interests in the status quo" have "exploited the relatively marginal nature of tourism development"... "Despite the reorientation of local governance, tourism policy appears to remain at the margins of professional and political concerns" (1998:304).

**Difficulties in measuring and monitoring tourism**

Agarwal (1999), Hope & Klemm (2001) and Law (1995) highlight some of the difficulties in measuring and monitoring the impact of local tourism policies. A study by the OECD in
1981 into the impact of tourist development policy noted that the monitoring of the outcomes of policies was weak, highlighting the rarity of any review of what actually occurred (Law 1995). A report by KPMG (2002) claims at the local level "the general lack of tourism funding limits the ability of organisations to implement and monitor recommendations thereby restricting effectiveness of the strategies" (2002:42). Agarwal (1999) identifies the difficulties in separating the impacts of tourism programmes from other policies and programmes and contextual changes. The difficulty in measuring the impact of tourism and tourism policies, coupled with the lack of resources available in the non statutory service areas means that local policy makers have insufficient economic information upon which to base decisions about the potential of tourism.

The RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001) indicates that a significant number of authorities formulate and implement tourism polices with very restricted budgets. Limited resource allocation has severely restricted research activities, with twenty eight percent of authorities with tourism policy, not engaging in tourism research at a local level. The remaining seventy two percent of authorities do not appear to be developing research into the wider impacts of tourism or monitoring research to evaluate their success. The lack of research to support tourism policy appears to be a result of the minimal budgets allocated to policy making in this area coupled with the difficulties in monitoring and measuring the impacts on tourism on the local economy.

**Myths about tourism policy making**

Tourism policy/planning is a specialism of town planning

The survey and historical analysis in this chapter challenge the notion that tourism policy should be understood in the context of spatial or land use planning indicating that there is very little evidence in the English context to support this idea. At the local level tourism policy making covers a wide range of issues and the evidence suggests that it is more closely linked to marketing and economic development than town planning (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001). In the context of this study it is necessary to understand tourism policy in broad terms and take into account the dimensions introduced in public policy analysis rather than just concentrating on the land use dimensions.
Tourism policy is characterised by integrated and sustainable approaches

Sustainable and integrated approaches to tourism development have political and popular support in Britain. The modernisation agenda has attempted to develop new structures within LA's to improve the linkages between different policy areas. The impact of this on tourism services is that they have been subsumed into parts of the organisation with a broader remit. This has the potential to integrate tourism into mainstream tourism policy making, however tourism officers are unlikely to have a powerful voice in these broader structures and may not have the capacity or power to influence wider policy.

The RELAT survey indicates that the influence of ideas and theories about sustainability and sustainable development on tourism policy are overstated in the English LA tourism context. While sustainability objectives are the second most commonly cited priority in tourism plans, there is little evidence of research to support the development of these objectives or research to monitoring their effectiveness. Sustainability implies a much broader understanding of the impacts of policies but there is little evidence of any local research to develop that understanding (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001)

Summary: The implications of contextual change for research into tourism policy making by English LA's

At the national level tourism has been an area of rapid change and marginal interest during the last 30 years. Tyler & Dinan (2001a) claim that both tourism policy content and the 'policy landscape' have changed as successive governments have been elected. The implications of the constant organisational changes and the marginality of tourism policies in mainstream policy has been a lack of clarity about the aims of tourism policy in England and a tendency of government to adopt a reactive rather than a strategic approach. Shaw et al (1991) highlight the extent to which policy making has been left to sub-state agencies that have produced non statutory strategy documents.

At the local level research (by Agarwal, 1999; Richards, 1991; Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001; Thomas & Thomas, 1998 and Tyler & Dinan, 2001a &b) highlights the messiness and complexity of the tourism policy arena. English LA's take a wide variety of approaches
developing tourism policies through a range of plans and strategies with different foci and objectives. LA's are involved in the preparation of tourism strategies, and a range of other strategies and plans which cover some aspects of tourism i.e. cultural strategies, economic development strategies/plans, land use plans. Research by Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) indicates that it is difficult to make generalisations about local tourism policy in terms of its nature, organisational setting, approach or funding. In one LA tourism policy may be predominantly focussed on marketing, in another economic development and in a third visitor management. The complexity and variety of approaches identified in their survey, highlights the difficulty in adopting a research approach that relies on a single or simple conceptualisation or that makes a-priori assumptions about tourism policy.

This chapter highlights the extent to which tourism policy making in English LA's is context specific and occurs within a wider environment which is dynamic and complex. These factors present challenges to policy researchers highlighting the need to clarify the characteristics, meaning and scope of tourism policy activity in a specific location and then to research in a way that takes account of complexity and dynamism. The next chapter will take these ideas forward and develops a research strategy to take account of context, complexity and change.
CHAPTER 5 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter identifies the research strategy adopted for this study. It considers relevant theories and reflects upon the challenges, ideas and techniques they present, it then articulates the specific methods of data collection and analysis and finally discusses the administration of the study. The research questions and aims of the investigation are outlined below.

Research questions

1. What are the main factors that influence tourism policy in an English LA in the view of those people involved in the process?

Research aims

1. To identify and investigate the complex factors/circumstances that influence tourism policy activity and develop understanding of the:
   a. nature and dimensions of those factors (what they are and how they affect policy activity)
   b. relative importance of those factors
   c. relationships between those factors
   d. implications of those factors for the practice or enactment of tourism policies
2. To provide a new perspective on tourism policy activities informed by the opinion of local policy makers
3. To build theory that is grounded in the experiences and perceptions of local policy makers.
4. To develop a theoretical approach that provides new insights and broadens understanding of tourism policy making and planning to focus on what happens in practice and takes account the implications of broader contextual factors.
Conceptual orientation

The current study has been developed from the RELAT survey into tourism policy and planning by LAs in England. This survey investigates tangible elements of tourism policy making, including the structures, policies, research and budgets. It highlights a number of paradoxes, contradictions and inconsistencies and a complex array of contextual issues affecting tourism policy and planning (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001).

The current research attempts to understand how LA tourism policy/planning really functions i.e. rather than testing models which show how the policy process is said to behave, it will investigate how it actually behaves from the perspective of tourism policy makers. The methodology adopted for this study is qualitative and has been particularly influenced by grounded theorists and complexity theorists. These theories will be discussed later in the chapter.

Methodological conventions in qualitative tourism research

Phillimore & Goodson (2004) investigate the methodological conventions of qualitative research and suggest that the majority of qualitative tourism research demonstrates positivist tendencies. They demonstrate this by referring to the preponderance of studies that seek to quantify qualitative data, that are based on predetermined rigid research agendas, that seek to generalise and classify behaviour into a range of categories (such as tourism typologies), that place little emphasis on methodological issues and ethnographic accounts and that are depersonalised and lack reflexivity.

Phillimore & Goodson (2004) suggest where tourism researchers have attempted to move away from positivist research they have adopted an eclectic approach to developing methodology. They claim this arises from the multi-disciplinary nature of tourism that has given researchers relative freedom to choose and combine approaches. Patton (2002) highlights the philosophical and methodological controversy of mixing different research methods in this way but says the practicality of trying to gather the most relevant information for evaluation outweighs concern about methodological purity.
The variety of methodological approaches and the mix of approaches developed by
Tourism researchers who have tried to move away from quantitative approaches and
positivism has resulted in the researcher being bound by fewer rules or conventions than
would be the norm in other areas. Alternative methodological approaches have been
investigated, to determine the best way to research and develop understanding of a
range of complex factors from the perspective of a variety of people. Chapter 3 provides
evidence of tourism research that encompasses ideas from chaos and complexity theory
as a way of understanding complex phenomena. It illustrates the lack of discussion in
the tourism literature about the implications of complexity theory on methodology i.e.
how to research complex phenomena in a way that takes account of their complexity.

Concepts underpinning the research strategy

The RELAT survey was developed within the quantitative/positivist tradition and the
findings present an explanation about the tangible elements of the policy process. This
approach to conceptualising tourism policy and planning by focusing on its physical
manifestations is dominant in tourism literature and is supported by theorists such as
these tangible elements presents an interesting but incomplete picture of the tourism
policy process. The methods adopted are limited, in that they do not enable
investigation into inconsistencies and paradoxes in the data that appear to arise as a
result of contextual factors, communications and a range of human behaviours. The
current research draws from the RELAT survey, which is used to provide baseline data
and a partial picture of tourism planning and policy making. It is designed from the
experience and learning from this survey and focuses on providing an understanding of
the practice of tourism planning or policy from the perspective of participants in the
process and from the "bottom up". It is intended to provide a perspective that can help
to develop and deepen understanding of practice and can take account of contextual
factors.

The process of developing a qualitative research strategy has been exploratory and has
evolved through extensive investigation into policy research in other areas by Sanderson
by Stacey (2001, 2003), Shaw (2002) and Fonseca(2002). This research has been
developed in the belief that thinking about complex phenomena should be supported by a research strategy that is capable of taking account of complexity and multiple perspectives.

Grounded theory has been selected to underpin the research strategy on the basis that it offers a methodology with "positivist rigour" and allows the researcher to bring in other data when it is relevant. However, a growing interest in the contribution and insights from complexity theory leads to some departures from a strict adherence to the grounded methodology. These are discussed in the sections about the role of the researcher and reflexivity and largely played out in the theorising and writing up stage. In writing up, the researcher adopts the narrative approach which enables discussion of her own findings and ideas within the context of multiple interpretations of data, rather than presenting consensus around her ideas.

The research strategy was developed in the knowledge that any theory arising as a result of this study was likely to be context specific and may not be capable of generalisation into the wider world. It develops a study that is exploratory and has descriptive and explanatory power. It describes what happens from the practitioner's perspective in one LA (supported by parallel primary research into another LA) and through theming, coding and writing up, makes sense of it. Whilst it may have limited predictive power within its context, it is unlikely to have the broad ranging predictive power associated with positivist thinking and theorising. The study is intended to challenge dominant ways of conceptualising tourism planning and provide new insights to develop understanding of tourism planning to take account of complexity and context.

The research questions for this study aim to develop a deeper, multi-dimensional understanding of tourism policy and planning and require a qualitative research strategy. The questions require a research strategy that enables the consideration of an array of contextual factors in "the real world", studying those phenomena in "all their complexity" (Leedy & Ormarod, 2001:147) and illustrating multiple voices/perspectives around any emerging themes.

The development of a qualitative research strategy for this investigation has been influenced by complexity and grounded theorists. The investigation is practice-based
reflecting the concern of many researchers including Jenkins (1999) for research to "close the gap" between theory and practice. The aim is to develop a study that is naturalistic, focussing on the "real world", emergent, exploring issues and data as they unfold and attempts to understanding the world from the perspective the participants in the policy process. (Patton, 2002; Phillimore & Goodson, 2004)

Phillimore & Goodson (2004) suggest that tourism researchers need to move beyond the idea of qualitative research as "a set of methods" and towards a deeper understanding in terms of "a set of thinking tools which enable them to consider different ways of approaching research and uncovering new ways of knowing" (2004:15). These concerns have been reflected in the efforts to develop a methodology that encourages thinking outside the positivist frame and enables the consideration of multiple perspectives of complex phenomena.

For this study information is collected in two distinct case study areas. Yin (2003) identifies several advantages of the case study that "allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events" (2003:1) and is able "to deal with a full variety of evidence -- documents, artefacts, interviews and observations." (2003:8). He says that this type of approach is particularly appropriate when "the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (2003:13) and as a way of explaining "the presumed causal links in real life interventions that are too complex for survey or experimental strategies" (2003:15). The major difference between Yin's definition of a "case study approach" and grounded theory is the role of theory development prior to data collection. Yin's approach requires the development of theoretical propositions prior to data collection and analysis whereas a grounded approach avoids specifying theoretical propositions at the outset. The implications of these two approaches and the method adopted for the study will be discussed later in the Chapter.

The research area is characterised by a complex web of relationships and a range of tangible and intangible factors and the first task is to consider how to research and develop theory to take account of this complexity. While there is evidence of some debate about chaos and complexity in the tourism literature there is no explicit discussion about the methodological implications of complexity. This is discussed in
Chapter 3, which investigates the work of theorists from a spectrum of disciplines who are engaged in a debate about whether and how key concepts from complexity “science” can be applied to human or social interactions. These include Stacey (2003), Shaw (2002), Fonseca (2002), Tsoukas & Hatch (2001), Sanderson (2001) and Mitleton Kelly & Subhan (2001) who question the application of scientific approaches to social or human phenomena and consider ways to develop the “art” of complexity theory and theorising. These authors identify the importance of complexity theory in terms of its role in expanding ways of thinking about change within complex environments. They argue that a range of tangible and intangible factors affect complex social phenomena. They have developed qualitative approaches to their studies to try to describe and interpret these phenomena taking account of their complexity.

The work by these researchers indicates that the understanding of complex phenomena within social or human systems requires a research methodology that can encompass the inter-relationships, interactions and interconnectivity within complex social environments. This implies the rejection of models and methods that focus our attention on systems or parts of systems and that are "reductionist", simplifying processes and systems in order to understand them. They argue that research into complex social phenomena requires methods which enable the appreciation and discussion of complexity and focus attention on people who experience and influence those phenomena.

“The implications of complexity are highly problematical for positivist social science because empirical regularities based upon observable social phenomena are likely to be highly misleading representations of the way in which complex systems actually work” (Sanderson, 2001:443).

These debates are highly relevant to the current research and have influenced the development of a research strategy drawing from the experiences of organisational and public policy theorists who have an interest in researching complex human phenomena in a way that captures and takes account of their complexity. The research strategy for the case studies has been influenced by grounded theory, a methodological approach, developed by Glaser & Strauss in the 1960’s which aims to “bridge the gap between theoretically “uninformed” empirical research and empirically
"uninformed" theory by grounding theory in data" Goulding (2002:41). It provides a systematic procedure for collecting and analysing qualitative data and guides the researcher towards theory building, from description through abstraction to conceptual categorisation (Glaser & Strauss, 1968; Goulding, 2002). It seeks to predict, explain and to provide a perspective on the actions, words and behaviour of those under study (Glaser & Strauss, 1968). Grounded theory emphasises theory development and building that is true to the data. Theorists challenge positivist perceptions of theory as "the formulation of some discovered aspect of a pre-existing reality...." and take the view that "truth is enacted and theories are interpretations made from given perspectives" (Goulding, 2002:43).

Grounded theory is based upon a belief in,

- "the need to get out in the field if one wants to understand what is going on
- the importance of theory grounded in reality
- the nature of experience in the field for the subjects and researcher as continually evolving
- the active role of persons in shaping the worlds they live in through the process of symbolic interaction
- an emphasis on change and process and the variability and complexity of life, and
- the interrelationship between meaning in the perception of subjects and their action" (Glaser 1992:16).

Grounded theorists engage in debates about method and process with a clarity that is unusual in qualitative method. They establish a collection of rules and procedures for collecting evidence which include

- The need to study phenomena using the perspectives or voice of those studied.
- The need to collect and analyse data simultaneously and to revisit, add to and refine theory. This includes clear advice on what should happen at different stages of interpretation, including the process of identifying concepts, categories and developing theories.
- The need to collect a range of data including policy documents, secondary data and even statistics providing the information has relevance to the study (Glaser & Strauss, 1968).

Grounded theory is not a tightly integrated theoretical school. The main theorists, Glaser & Strauss initially worked together and then developed their own separate paths in developing and refining the theory. Strauss & Corbin (1998) refined grounded theory in 1990 by introducing a new coding process emphasising conditions, context, action/interaction strategies and consequences. They developed frameworks, matrices and conceptual diagrams as a method to show the relationships between concepts and “to conceptualise beyond the immediate field of study” (Goulding, 2002:45). Goulding (2002) summarises the differences between the two approaches thus

"On the one hand Glaser stresses the interpretive, contextual and emergent nature of theory development, while, on the other the late Strauss appeared to have emphasised highly complex and systematic coding techniques" (2002:47).

Goulding (2002) identifies a number of researchers who have criticised Strauss & Corbin’s approach including Coyle (1997) who is critical of the way in which they break down or fragment the idea of theoretical sampling and proposes that this confuses the issue and Melia (1996) who argues that the formulaic nature of their work is oriented to description, leads to the over-conceptualisation of single incidents and lacks attention to activities which are associated with theory building. The most significant critic of the approach advocated by Strauss & Corbin in 1990, and 1998, is Glaser (1992, 1998) who argues that theory should “only explain the phenomena under study” (Goulding, 2002:45) and that their methods propose “so many rules, strictures, dictums and models to follow one can only get lost in trying to figure it all out” (Glaser, 1992:104). Glaser (1992) claims that Strauss’s overemphasis on mechanics of research reduces the degree of theoretical sensitivity and insightful meaning. He is particularly critical of the use of pre-defined matrices which he claims forces preconceptions on the data, prevents the data from speaking for itself and undermines its relevance.

The approach adopted by Strauss & Corbin (1998) fits more closely with the background and experience of the researcher and appears to offer more security, with its pre-defined
matrices and clear concrete principles and procedures. However after careful consideration of the aims and nature of the study the decision was made to develop a research strategy drawing from the work of Glaser & Strauss (1968) and the subsequent refinements and clarifications advocated by Glaser (1978, 1992, 1993 and 1998). The appeal of this approach is the emphasis on letting the data tell its own story with the focus on the interpretive, contextual and emergent nature of theory. The researcher's major concern in adopting Glaser's approach is the fear of the unfamiliar and her perception that this approach involves some risk. This approach involves trusting that theory will emerge from the data and that she can develop the skill and sensitivity to build theory in this way.

Grounded theory has most frequently been used to investigate behaviour and a wealth of case study material is available on its applications in sociological inquiry, marketing, health and medicine. Much of this research focuses on peoples' motivations and personal experiences, considering the characteristics of individuals and the way this impacts on their behaviour. These studies focus on the individual and the factors that affect human behaviour or motivations in specific settings.

Phillimore & Goodson (2004) suggest that tourism researchers have rarely used the "full grounded theory". They identify a range of tourism research that is influenced by grounded theory including Miller’s (2001) use of the Delphi technique to structure group communication in respect of the development of indicators for sustainable tourism and Burns & Sancho’s (2003) use of grounded theory principles to present and theme oral data from interviews. It is interesting to note that both of these studies are outside the traditional "behavioural" frame of grounded theory in that they focus on individual’s perceptions of ideas or processes rather than their behaviours or motivations. These tourism studies do not focus on the background or motivation of people outside of the frame of the study but on their perceptions of events, processes or interactions.

Grounded theory has not been directly applied to tourism policy research but a number of writers including Elliot (1997), Hall & Jenkins (1995), Hall et al (1997) and Hall (2000) have highlighted the more human and intangible aspect of policy. The current study is developed from the ideas of those researchers who have adopted a social conceptualisation of the meaning and process of policy. It focuses on the perspectives of
people involved in the policy process and is underpinned by a research strategy drawing from the experience of grounded and complexity theorists.

The research is intended to present a challenge to tourism theory that reifies tourism policy making and planning, conceptualising it in terms of its physical manifestations such as written policies and policy documents i.e. Inskeep (1991), Godfrey & Clarke (2000), Gunn (2002) and Veal (2002). Conceptualisation in these terms is reductionist, simplifying and focusing our attention on the tangible parts of policy making. Consequently these studies focus on the things that have to be done to create written policies, rather than the communications, learning and human behaviours that shape the process. The current study aims to refocus attention away from the specific techniques and methods that should be employed to develop policies and towards trying to understand the wider context and human aspects of the process.

Implications for data collection and analysis

The conceptualisation of policy as something that emerges from human action, and interaction rather than as a set of procedures or techniques, or its physical manifestations, has implications on the design of research strategy. Complexity theory adds another layer to the research question and a conceptualisation of LA tourism policy making as a complex phenomenon, which is embedded within a wide range of social processes adds a further dimension to the study.

Grounded theory has been chosen to underpin the study and offers a way to theorise about tourism policy in human terms on the basis of people's perceptions. Attention has been given to the contributions from complexity theory and in portraying complex issues in their complex or multi-faceted form i.e. from the multiple perspectives of those people involved in the process. The intention in developing this study is to develop and deepen understanding of the relationship between tourism policy and its context stemming from actors perceptions of issues and processes. The study is concerned with documenting and analysing the realities of the relationship from the perspectives of the practitioner and developing understanding from the "bottom-up".
The research process – method of data collection

This section identifies the theory underpinning the methods and techniques used for this study.

Background research

The current research develops from the RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001), which examines the organisation of tourism policy making and implementation within LAs. Data from this survey provides descriptive statistical information and has been used as base-line data. The perceived limitations of the survey provide the impetus for a deeper, qualitative study to try to develop an understanding of tourism policy making and planning from the perspective of practitioners.

This research is supported by a multi-disciplinary literature review that develops a broad understanding of the nature and context of tourism planning based upon a wide range of relevant research and theory. At the first stages of the study wide ranging material on methodology, complexity and policy studies were considered however the literature review was suspended when the grounded approach was chosen to support his research. The review was formally conducted and written after the primary research provides the context of the study and has been used to interrogate the findings of the survey. The review considers complexity theory and its applications to social/human processes and highlights the need for a holistic and integrative approach to research. The main relevant aspects of the above mentioned theories are discussed in the literature review Chapters 2 and 3.

The implications of prior knowledge on methodology

The researcher has developed research into tourism policy (Stevenson 1998, 2002; Stevenson & Lovatt 2001), regularly reviews tourism literature in connection with her teaching and research, and developed and delivered policy in LAs between 1986 and 1997. This presents problems in developing a grounded approach, which requires the researcher to suspend prior knowledge and experience when undertaking research.
Glaser says "The first step in grounded theory is to enter the substantive field for research without knowing the problem" (1998:122).

The researcher's degree of familiarity with policy theories and practical experience in the field meant that she has some awareness and preconceptions of the problem. It was the prior experience and the RELAT survey research that had led to the exploration of theories and methodologies, and the impetus for a study that focussed on practice from the perspectives of policy makers. Whilst it could be argued that the researcher was moving beyond the boundaries of her existing knowledge by researching policy making in a different way, it was difficult completely to suspend prior knowledge.

The researcher attempted to approach this study with openness and with a willingness to challenge her pre-conceptions. She attempted to limit the impact of her existing knowledge in the field during her interviews where she was very careful not to ask leading questions. She made the decision to suspend research for the literature review when she made the decision to adopt a research strategy that was influenced by grounded theory. She distanced herself from the literature until the analysis stage and undertook a formal literature review after the first draft of the findings of primary data had been completed. Conscious effort was made to put experience to one side, but the "common" experience between interviewer and interviewee in making policy in LA's is likely to have affected interviewee responses and to have given additional insight in asking follow up questions to help to clarify perceptions. It is not possible to measure the extent to which prior experience constrained meaning and limited theory building.

The impact of prior knowledge meant that the approach adopted for the study fell between Yin's (2003) definition of a case study which articulates a clear role of theory development prior to data collection and a grounded theory approach which requires the researcher to enter the field without prior knowledge, or to suspend that knowledge.

The research interview

With grounded theory the most common form of interview is the unstructured or semi-structured conversational interview. These methods are favoured because they have the potential to generate rich and detailed accounts of experience from the perspective of the individual (Goulding, 2002). Unstructured interviewing engenders flexibility and is
designed so that questions flow from context. The advantage of this type of approach is its responsiveness and the potential it offers for actors to define interests and issues. Difficulties with this approach include the time and number of interviews required before themes emerge, the difficulties in analysing the diversity of material collected and the possibility of "interviewer effects" such as bias, preconceived ideas and leading questions (Patton, 2002).

In the semi-structured approach the interviewer identifies subject areas and these are explored with the interviewee. This gives the freedom to develop conversations within the subject areas. It has the advantage that it provides a degree of focus and structure to the interviews and will make the best use of limited time. This approach is more systematic, delimiting in advance issues to be explored (Patton, 2002).

Glaser (1998) suggests that interviews must not be taped saying that the disadvantages include, transcription time which slows down coding and analysing, the problem that taping leads to "properline" data i.e. respondents say what the researcher expects them to say or to present the official line. He advises that the taping edits the truth and generates superficial responses and superficial analysis of the data.

**Reflexivity and the researcher**

Both the unstructured and the semi structured interview techniques require the interviewer to play an active role in the research process and to develop qualities of self-awareness and reflexivity.

"Reflexivity reminds the qualitative inquirer to observe herself or himself so as to be attentive to and conscious of the cultural, political, social, linguistic, and ideological origins of his or her own perspective...." (Patton 2002:65)

Strauss & Corbin (1998) identify "self" as an instrument of data collection, and highlight the importance of attributes such as authenticity, credibility, intuitiveness, receptivity, reciprocity and sensitivity. Leedy & Ormarod (2001) highlight the role of researcher as a research instrument during interviews highlighting the need for "a rigorous spirit of self awareness and self criticism, as well as openness to new ideas" (2001:147).
The researcher was aiming towards what Silverman (2005) calls "empathic neutrality", using personal insight whilst taking a non-judgemental stance in the collection and analysis of data. This required an acknowledgment of her experience and background (in Appendix 1) and a process of reflection to consider the impact of that on her research. Whilst the researcher attempted to put her prior experience, knowledge and beliefs to one side she recognises that it affected the choice of methodological approach. Goulding (2002) draws upon work by Annells (1996), Knafl (1996) Guba & Lincoln (1994) and Stern (1994), identifying the significance of the researcher’s experiences, beliefs, style of working and way of thinking in the formulation of their research questions and their choice of methodology.

The research process – method of analysis

This section outlines relevant theory and specific techniques adopted to analyse data during this research project. Initially the benefits and pitfalls of manual vs. computer-aided analysis are considered. Then the principles of memo writing, open coding, axial coding, theoretical emergence and process of abstraction through constant comparison and the development of categories and writing up are discussed.

Manual vs. computer aided analysis

There is considerable debate about the use of computers in the analysis of qualitative data where the aim is to look for conceptual or theoretical significance of data rather than statistical significance (Di Domenico, 2003). Di Domenico draws from the work of Seale, (2000) outlining the advantages of computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) which include speed in the handling of large volumes of data and rigour. Its advocates claim that it eases the process of transcribing and identifying and cross checking concept development. They argue that packages offer a range of flexible tools and applications and that context can be preserved through retrieval and index systems using header and sub headers (Richards & Richards, 1994 in Goulding, 2002).

The limitations of CAQDAS include a concern that computers may impose a narrow approach to the process of analysis. Di Domenico (2003) cites work from Ceffey et al
(1996) who argue that computers can be used effectively for the 'code and retrieve' approach to analysis that stems from grounded theory. However Glaser (1998) remains critical of what he calls "technological traps", which hinder the development of grounded theory. He claims that computer packages constrain the researcher by building implicit assumptions, systems and formulations into research. He is specifically critical of the NUDIST package and claims that the creator lacks the experience of doing grounded theory and does not understand its full creative requirements. Glaser (1998) says:

"...hinders and cops out of the skill of doing grounded theory. It numbs and stultifies these processes as it legitimates non grounded theory production" (1998:185).

Goulding (2002) highlights the role of the researcher in weaving concepts and categories into theory and says software packages do not address crucial task of theory construction. She claims "most of the time during qualitative data analysis is spent on reading, rereading, interpreting, comparing, and reflecting on the texts". Goulding (2004) cites work by Dembrowski & Hammer Lloyd (1995) who express concern that data analysis by computer becomes mechanistic to the detriment of intuition and creativity. She also highlights the warning by the original authors of grounded theory against the overemphasis on coding at the expense of theory emerging.

Di Domenico (2003) explores a range of software including QSR Nudist (or Nvivo), the Ethnograph and WinMax. She identifies a positive aspect of QSR Nudist as its code based theorising functions but considers the modelling format restrictive. She adopts Win Max for her research but uses it selectively for the code and sort stages. The process of charting, mapping and interpretation are conducted manually to enable critical thinking, interpretation and researcher intuition. Di Domenico (2003) writes about the practical experience of using WinMax and highlights the need for data to be entered into a word processing package prior to being imported into an analytical package. She contends that contrary to popular perception the task of transcription, reading and coding data remains very time consuming when using software.
Goulding (2002) asserts that Richards & Richards (1991) the creators of NUDIST acknowledge the limits of their package in terms of theory construction, which cannot be formalised. They point out that the programme "does not allow for the visual display of conceptual-level diagrams and models that show emerging theory" (Goulding, 2002:94). This means that the adoption of computer-aided analysis can only be partial and requires the researcher to move between computer and pencil and paper approaches.

"many computer techniques are only marginal to, may even be inimical to, the tasks of "grounded theory". The process of theory emergence requires a different ability: to see the data as a whole, then to leave data behind, exploring the lines of this segment of that text. To code and retrieve text is to cut it up. The "grounded theory" method leaves text almost untouched. The researchers' contact with the data is light, hovering above the text and rethinking its meanings, then rising from it to comparative, imaginative reflections. It is the difference between the touch of the scissors and that of a butterfly" (Richards & Richards, 1991:260 cited in Goulding, 2002:95).

**Developing Theory**

Grounded theory evolves during the process of field research, and is produced by the continuous interplay between data collection and analysis (Glaser & Strauss 1968, Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002). A grounded approach involves the collection and analysis of data at the same time. Glaser says, "the process of data collection is "controlled" by emerging theory"(1978:38) which means that the nature of the study changes over the research period on the basis of the emerging data.

Grounded theorists and researchers have adopted different approaches to conceptualising and operationalising the grounded method and in this sense the method has been rewritten and evolved over time. Goulding (2002) identifies several "constants" in the methodology as it has evolved including

"the constant comparison of data to develop concepts and categories; the gradual abstraction of data from the descriptive level to higher order theoretical categories...the use of theoretical sampling as opposed to purposive sampling,
the writing of theoretical memo's which help track the process and provide a sense of reorientation and the saturation of data...(requiring the researcher to) stay in the field until no new evidence emerges" (2002:46).

**Interpreting Interview Data**

The analysis process started from full transcription of the interview, then line-by-line analysis was used to identify key words or phrases connecting the account to the experience under investigation. During this process memos were written to document impressions and codes and categories were generated and reviewed. Further interviews from each area were then transcribed and analysed in the same way until patterns or themes started to emerge. Open coding was used to break down data into distinct units of meaning and these units were then labelled to generate concepts. A more sophisticated method of coding called axial coding was then used to cluster concepts into groups that seem to indicate a relationship that says something about the phenomena under study (Glaser, 1992; Goulding, 2002). In the next section these analytical technique will be considered in more depth and discussed in terms of their application to the study.

**Using Memos**

Goulding (2002) identifies the use of memos throughout the research process as a central part of grounded theory method. Memos map ideas that have been noted during data collection and illustrate the journey toward identifying and defining concepts and the emergence of theory. Memos can be used to generate relationships, abstract frameworks and identify problems and can provide direction. Goulding (2002) says memos should be introduced by a title or caption (usually a category or concept) and should be kept separate from the data. She says

"using memos as data is part of the process of abstraction, and therefore when writing memos, ideas should be expressed in conceptual terms, not necessarily in people terms. Memos should be a consistent part of the process and should be generated simultaneously throughout the sampling and data collection stages" (2002:65).
Coding Strategies

In grounded theory coding strategies are adopted as a way of breaking down interviews and other appropriate data into “distinct units of meaning” (Goulding, 2002:74). Glaser (1992) defines coding as “conceptualising data by constant comparison of incident with incident, and incident with concept, to emerge more categories and their properties”. (1992:38). The first stage of this process, called open coding, aims to open up the interview data. Open coding fragments data and identify concepts and uses constant comparison to scrutinises the data for every meaning (Glaser, 1992).

"Open coding is the process of breaking down the data into distinct units of meaning. It is the product of early analysis and describes what is happening in the data. Open codes may comprise key words, phrases or sentences" (Goulding, 2002:170).

Goulding (2002:169) defines constant comparison as “the exploration of similarities and differences across incidents in data”. Glaser (1992) says that this part of the coding process is a fundamental part of the method and is where incidents are coded for properties and categories that connect them together. These initial codes are labelled “to generate concepts” which are “clustered into descriptive categories” (Goulding 2002:74). Once concepts have been identified they are analysed in more depth and are grouped under more abstracted “higher order” concepts that “explain what is going on” (Strauss & Corbin 1998:95). At this stage incidents are compared within the data, between the data to incidents recalled from experience or from the literature. This process of “systematic comparison” sensitises the researcher to properties and dimensions in the data that might have been overlooked (Strauss & Corbin,1998).

Axial coding is described by Goulding (2002:169) as “a more sophisticated method of coding data which seeks to identify incidents which have a relationship to each other.” Axial coding is an important method to achieve a higher level of abstraction that aims to lead to an appreciation of dynamic interrelationships between concepts (Glaser,1992; Goulding, 2002). Axial Coding is defined as the
"process of relating categories to their subcategories, termed "axial" because coding occurs around the axis of a category, linking categories at the level of properties and dimensions... (It begins the process of) reassembling data that were fractured during open coding" (Strauss & Corbin 1998:123-124).

The analysis continues through a process of axial coding and abstraction in which data is reassembled. At this stage the descriptive codes become subsumed into a higher order category which unites "the theoretical concepts to offer an explanation or theory of the phenomenon" (Goulding, 2002:169).

**Writing Up - Contributions from Grounded Theory**

Glaser (1978) advises that in grounded theory the style of writing should follow the conventions of the sociological monograph with an introduction outlining the general problem, the methodology, a prose outline of the substantive theory and then the theory. He advises that the introduction should not derive the problem from a general perspective or from a literature search but should be derived from the grounded theory that has been generated in the research. He advises against the use of summaries saying "A summary is redundant and an affront to those readers who have actually read the paper and a "cop out" for those who have not read it" (1978:132).

Glaser's (1998) advice on writing up first drafts is very straightforward. He suggests that by the writing up stage the researcher has captured the meaning of the data through extensive "sorting" of memo's and this stage is merely writing up piles of sorted memos. He refers to the need to "funnel down" to the core relevance and says that at this stage the researcher should not be discussing ideas and concepts with others on the basis that this may deplete the "energy" behind an idea. Glaser highlights the need to "write conceptually by making theoretical statements about the relationship between concepts, rather than writing descriptive statements about people" (1978:133). He identifies "flip-flopping" or making the theoretical statement come first as a tactic to develop conceptualisation during the rewrite stage.
Contributions from Complexity Theory

A number of complexity theorists including Stacey (2003) Mitleton Kelly & Subhan (2002) develop “narratives” as a way of bringing together themes using the experience, definitions and understanding of those involved in the tourism policy process. A narrative is “…a story line linked by reflections, comments upon and categorisations of, elements of the story line” (Stacey, 2003:350). Narratives provide a way of creating “…meanings by bringing things into relation, by making connections, by drawing attention in one way or another so as to create a pathway in time, a train of events” (Flyvbjerg, 2001:27). They are “…accounts which contain transformation (change over time)...they have an overall plot and are a central means with which people connect together past and present, self and other” (Lawler 2002:242).

Tsoukas & Hatch (2001) say that the narrative mode is not just about reflecting or passively registering. Narratives allow the reader to explore some material first hand and let the story unfold, but give the narrator a clear role in linking, reflecting upon and categorising elements of the story. In developing a narrative the researcher becomes involved in the story rather than trying to stand outside and observe what happens in a scientific way. Narratives allow for the constructive role of the reader who can participate in the story to select meanings (Bruner, 1988; cited in Stacey, 2003). Narratives provide a way for the narrator to become involved in the process, a way of dissolving categories and recognising and of accepting the paradoxes inevitably created in complex social environments (Shaw, 2002).

Narratives work from the premise that “individuals and groups interpret the social world and their place within it” (Lawler, 2002:243). They allow the story to unfold from multiple perspectives of the people involved which are diverse, complex and sometimes conflicting and attempt to capture the depth and richness of the experience (Flyvbjerg, 1998; Mitleton Kelly & Subhan, 2002). Narratives can be “used to put chaotic experiences into causal sequences and explain dilemmas and deviations” (McCleod, 1996 cited in Stacey 2003:351) and in this way they have a problem solving function.

In developing a narrative approach it is intended to provide contextuality and create research that has meaning and connection. It is intended to explore dynamic human
processes in a way that leads to "dynamic understanding" which "is holistic, historical and qualitative, eschewing deductive systems and causal mechanisms and laws" (Kellert 1993:114 cited in Tsoukas & Hatch 2001). The narrative approach is favoured as it enables the study of the policy practice dynamic in a way that accepts and acknowledges its complexity and environment. It enables detailed research into policies within their context and provides a way of understanding the influences of the relationships between the key contextual factors. The narrative approach is appropriate to the study of the policy process as it stresses the importance of relationships and discourse in constructing meaning and draws attention to the way that action emerges as a result of interaction between people involved in the process.

Research administration

This section identifies the practical administration of the research referring to theory where appropriate. A summary of the research process is presented in Appendix 2.

Background of the study

The current research developed from the RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001) which examines the organisation of tourism policy making and implementation within LAs. This survey investigates LA involvement in tourism, the extent and type of LA tourism policy, tourism policy objectives, the level and type of tourism monitoring research, the allocation of tourism budgets and good practice in implementation of tourism policies.

The primary research for RELAT survey includes a series of meetings with actors in the tourism policy process at local and national level (including LGA and DCMS), and colleagues within the School of Architecture and the Built Environment at the University of Westminster. These meetings helped to frame, design and pilot a survey to investigate the nature of LA tourism policy-making in England. For the survey, data was gathered using a postal survey and this was entered onto a database on SPSS. The data provided descriptive statistical information and analysis of these data allowed the researcher to develop an understanding of the context of tourism policy making by LAs in England. It provided opportunities to identify key actors within LAs and enabled
appropriate case study authorities to be identified and also informed the selection of a research strategy for this study.

The RELAT survey occurred before formal registration for the PhD. However the collection and analysis of data for this survey had a central role in developing the current research as it provided the insights, knowledge and impetus to carry out a further detailed qualitative study from the perspective of the people involved in the process. These data were used, together with the analysis of existing policy documents and academic literature from a variety of disciplines as a way of exploring, explaining and grounding or supporting the qualitative data collected during the PhD research.

The selection of case study areas and interviewees

The two case study areas, Leeds and Cambridge, were selected using data from the RELAT survey, on the basis that they appeared to offer the potential to develop "thick" or "rich" case study material. During the research for the Survey authorities were asked if they would be willing to participate in further research and 25 positive responses were received. Further research was undertaken by phone and e-mail to supplement the findings of the survey and to assess suitability for a deeper and more detailed study. Each LA was assessed in terms of the following criteria; they must have a tourism strategy and a history of tourism policy making prior to the development of the strategy; they must have a tourism budget that was sufficient to support research and marketing activities and to employ dedicated tourism staff (and at least one of these to be employed outside of the TIC) and they must have undertaken local tourism research. These criteria were intended to identify LAs who had an active engagement in tourism policy making. At the end of this stage, three LAs were identified, two in cities and one in a rural area. The decision was made to progress the research within the city areas on the basis that common themes were more likely to emerge in these areas. The two cases study areas demonstrated common features in terms of their engagement in tourism policy but are very different with Cambridge established as a traditional historic destination and Leeds as an emerging urban/cosmopolitan destination.

Initially the tourism manager in each case study area was approached for a conversational interview about their perceptions of the issues affecting tourism policy
making in their authorities and the 'key' people in the process. The first interview led to further interviews with 'key' people who were asked about their perceptions of the issues affecting policy and people in the process. This process of participants identifying other key participants is known as "snowball or chain sampling" and was an appropriate way of identifying the most important people from a ground level or participant perspective. Snowball sampling has the advantage of providing a variety of information-rich interviews cases and of identifying key names and interactions that are not clear from formal organisational structures (Patton, 2002). This approach supports the choice to focus on people involved in the policy process and relies on their definition of the relevant issues in the study area. It enables the research process to be led by the data collected in the field rather than any pre-conceived notions about the relevant people and issues.

In the first and second phases, eleven people were interviewed, seven in Leeds and five in Cambridge. These people were those most frequently mentioned in interviews and in most cases were those identified in the interviews with the tourism manager. In two instances people who were due to retire before the interviews nominated someone else to be interviewed. The Chief Executive in Cambridge was mentioned as a key player but refused to be interviewed, claiming that tourism was not one of his priorities, and was unable to suggest anyone other than the tourism manager to answer questions on tourism. The interviews were carried out with officers and councillors inside the LA's and other key players outside and provided a multi-dimensional conceptualisation of the issues affecting the policy process. The analysis arising from these interviews provided a diverse range of material from which it was possible to identify a number of recurring themes.

The first interviews were undertaken in Leeds and transcribed and coded and a series of concepts and themes were identified. The process was repeated in Cambridge and a slightly different set of themes emerged. The detail of this process is discussed in more depth in the later in this chapter but during the process the decision was made not to develop a further set of interviews in Cambridge. This was made on the basis that there was very little tourism policy making activity progressing in the City, the policy focus had moved towards operational and service aspects of tourism and the reluctance of some of the key policy makers to participate in the interviews. The Cambridge interviews
performed a useful function and provided a range of themes which were often similar to those in Leeds and enhance understanding. The Cambridge interviews are discussed in more depth in Chapter 8 where they are used to reflect upon the themes and characteristics identified by the policy makers in Leeds.

As the study progressed into the third phase, with interviews concentrated around tourism policy making in Leeds, the sampling method changed from snowball sampling to theoretical sampling which was directed by the themes, categories and emerging theory from the first two phases (Goulding, 2003; Glaser 1978, 1992). In the third phase eight people were interviewed and individuals were included or excluded from the study, partly on the basis of the themes that had emerged in the first phase of interviews and partly to reflect changes in staffing responsibilities during the year.

**Interviews**

The interviews were designed to elicit explanations and developing understanding about the factors affecting tourism policy. Initially it was intended to collect information for the first interviews using what Patton (2002) calls “unstructured interviewing” and Shaw (2002) calls a dialectical or conversational approach. The first interview with the tourism officer from Leeds was in-depth and unstructured but the decision was made at the end of this interview to develop a series of broad topics and to structure subsequent interviews around these topics.

The structure of the remaining first and second stage interviews started with a preamble about the nature of the project and background of the researcher. This was important as the researcher’s experience of policy making in LAs informed the interest in the subject matter and the shared background experience developed trust and established rapport. The interviewee was then asked to identify the issues and interactions influencing the tourism policy process in their experience. Their responses usually led to reflections about key people, the place of tourism within the LA policy making, the political will to make tourism policy, the networks and joint arrangements to deliver tourism policies but where they did not cover all of these areas the interviewer made a broad inquiry into that aspect. The nature of the inquiry and its place in the interview depended upon the tone and flow of the conversation. Sometimes it was made in response to something the
interviewee had said and sometimes it was made as the interview drew to a close. At the end of each interview the interviewee was asked if there were any other important issues that had not been discussed. This gave them the scope to broaden out the frame of reference and introduce new themes.

The third phase of interviews were carried out in Leeds and aimed to expand information seeking elucidations and elaborations of ideas discussed at first meeting. A loose structure was developed around the researcher’s conceptualisation of themes identified in the first stage interview. Interviewees were invited to discuss and comment on the themes and other interpretations arising from the first interview. This enabled reflection between the researcher and the subject, and provided opportunities to revise interpretations. This constant checking meant that interpretation of data was an ongoing and two way process.

The rolling programme of interviews was designed towards thick description and after each phase of interviews was completed, the material was coded and recoded until themes were identified. The approach adopted enabled the researcher, to move back and forth between inductive open-ended encounters to more deductive attempts to theme ideas. The inductive approach was used to ascertain the dimensions of the study but after each stage of interviewing a more deductive approach was used to theme ideas and “solidify ideas that emerge from those more open-ended experiences” (Patton, 2002:253). At the first and second stages the research strategy was ‘naturalistic’ and the dimensions of the study were ‘grounded’ in and emerged from the fieldwork interviews rather than being imposed prior to the beginning of the study as in formal hypothesis and theory testing (Patton, 2002). This approach enabled participants in the policy process to have the central role in identifying themes during research process. At the third stage the themes arising from the first stage interviews were discussed and were open to modification and challenge by the participants in the process.

The first interview with the tourism manager in Leeds was not taped in accordance with advice from Glaser that taping interviews slows down coding and analysing, edits the truth and generates superficial responses. Notes were taken during the interview and were written up immediately after. This approach led to two problems, the first was that it was extremely difficult to develop sufficient rapport or engagement with the interviewee.
whilst trying to write detailed and useful notes. The interview atmosphere was pressurised by the attempt to engage with the interviewee, to listen and make sense of what she was saying and to make coherent notes at the same time. In this atmosphere, it was difficult to maintain the conventions of a conversation, such as eye contact, responding to facial expressions and humour. The interviewee was very guarded in her responses until the researcher stopped taking notes and engaged with her. The researcher also was concerned that she was not sufficiently skilled to take objective and accurate notes whilst under this pressure. In particular she was concerned that her listening and note taking might be more intense when the interviewee said things she expected to hear.

After the first interview the decision was made to tape the remainder of the interviews so that a verbal record of the full interview was available and the researcher could revisit this information during the research process. The decision to tape had a number of advantages including the ability to engage and converse with interviewees, to establish rapport and to probe and clarify issues as they emerged in the conversation. The act of transcribing led to direct engagement with the interview material and enabled thoughts and concepts to develop about this material. Memos were written to capture these thoughts. At the end of the transcription process data were held in several forms, written data were used to code in a formalised way and taped data provided conversational nuances and helped to clarify the meaning of comments within interviews. A full transcription of an interview is provided in Appendix 3 a memo in Appendix 4 and a coded text segment in Appendix 5.

Analysis

Manual analysis was adopted on the basis that the study topic and the methodology required the researcher to immerse herself in the data. This immersion meant repeatedly revisiting the data and ideas throughout the research process, reconsidering them as new data was collected and recoding to capture patterns or themes as they emerged. The interviews were collected on tape, the tapes were transcribed and during this process memo's written to capture thoughts about the data. Then the transcripts were coded, and recoded on the basis of themes emerging in other interviews. Again memo's were written to identify concepts and make sense of the relationships that
emerged between these concepts. Data collection and analysis happened concurrently during the process of collecting and writing up the findings of the research. Initially this focussed on just the material from the interviews, until key themes and characteristics had been identified and written up in the narratives in Chapter 7.

Once the narratives were completed a literature review was undertaken to try to understand and connect the study to wider literature on tourism policy (Chapter 2) complexity (Chapter 3) and the wider context of the study drawing from material on political ideology and governance (Chapter 4). The themes and characteristics identified in the narratives were evaluated using knowledge drawn from outside of the text of the transcribed interviews by personal reflections and by referring to literature as the analysis process progressed.

This iterative collection and analysis process was beyond the scope of any computer programme. The researcher had additional concerns arising from knowledge about her own mental processes and was aware that in using a computer package she would turn her attention to learning how the package operates (and constantly re-learning at each stage of collecting data in the field) and this would create a barrier and focus her attention away from the data itself.

**Memo writing**

The interview data were investigated using a number of techniques including memo writing and coding. In developing a style for writing memos initially a mixture of informal jottings and a formal structure was used and comparisons between the two methods were made. The formal approach inhibited the frequency of memo writing and whilst the memos were reflective their style and nature meant that half formed or unclear ideas were not included. The more informal memos tended to focus on specific methodological problems and were often expressions of frustration rather than well articulated and reasoned reflection. The approach to memo writing was reviewed in October 2004 on the basis of experience and of the checklist of advice on using memos developed by Miles & Huberman (1994) cited in (Goulding 2002). The informal structure was adopted as a first stage for all ideas with a focus on the needs and the thoughts of the researcher rather than any external audience. Half-formed ideas were
included and attention was directed to trying to map thinking and ideas as they emerged. Memos were not standardised but an attempt was made to title them. Memos were reviewed in terms of their content and reflexivity after each batch of interviews and as far as possible written up more formally as the research progressed. Appendix 4 illustrates a memo in an attempt to show how memo's are used to develop concepts and question the data.

**Coding strategy**

Interviews were transcribed and segments of text were colour coded by hand. This process enabled the creation of a basic set of coding categories on the basis of the content of the interviews. Appendix 5 demonstrates the coding and theming of a segment of interview text.

Once all interviews for the Leeds case study area had been transcribed and a basic preliminary coding had taken place, the transcripts were revisited by listening to the tapes again, reading the transcripts and re-reading the relevant memos. This process led to the broad codes being modified to take account of reflection and consideration of incidents across the seven interviews. The transcripts were considered individually, text was broken down into segments and each segment was scrutinised for meanings. The coding was used to identify patterns and reoccurring events in the data and comparing data from each respondent across the case study area. In considering the interpretations by respondents similarities were noted in the way their experiences were shared and expressed about the tourism policy and its context. Appendix 5 shows a list of the codes that were developed from the first and second phase interviews.

This process was then repeated for the Cambridge data. A period of 2 months elapsed between the collection, transcription and coding of the Leeds interviews and the same process in Cambridge. This enabled the researcher to distance herself from the first set of codes and to develop codes for Cambridge that were grounded in the data rather than imported from her learning about Leeds. After the interviews from Cambridge had been transcribed and coded, the data from the two case studies was considered again. Similarities and differences across the data were noted and core variables were identified. Some broad themes emerged over the two case study areas and some
specific and distinct issues emerged in each area which did not enable any direct comparison.

Grounded theorists suggest that when the core variables are discovered sampling becomes selective and focused upon the central themes or issues. Constant comparative analysis enables the researcher to develop the codes further as the process continues which directs further data collection. The process involves a mixture of induction and deduction, allowing for flexibility through research process and focussing on what is happening in the field rather than what should be happening (Coyle, 1997; Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding 2002).

Through this process of coding, conceptualising and theming the first interviews, a number of core variables were identified and these were used as a structure for subsequent interviews in Leeds. The principles of theoretical sampling directed by the emerging theory (Goulding 2002) led to the decision to focus the third stage interviews in Leeds. Tourism policy activity in Leeds was more intense and was characterised by change. It was worthwhile interviewing key people again in Leeds, to see if and how the key factors changed over time and to check whether different concepts and themes had emerged since the first stage. The third phase interviews took place a year after the first two phases and the interviewees were selected on the basis of the data and concepts arising from the first stage and more pragmatically on the basis of staffing changes that had occurred during the year. The third phase interviews provided opportunities to investigate the key concepts and emerging themes in more depth and to seek the views of people involved in the process about the ideas and themes emerging from the findings of the first stage interviews.

After the third phase interviews had been transcribed and coded, categories were identified and then the process of sorting the interviews and writing up the findings into two narratives began. During this process the coded transcripts were revisited repeatedly and more memos were written as connections and relationships were identified. This enabled the researcher to identify three main themes and later six characteristics that ran across the themes. Once the first draft of the narratives had been written a wide ranging literature review was undertaken (the range of material was influenced by previous LA policy making experience and research). The themes and
characteristics identified in the narratives were considered again against this broader range of data.

*Developing the narratives*

In writing up the research the narrative mode was used as a way of explicitly considering the role and perceptions of researcher. Initially an attempt was made to write up the narrative relying almost exclusively on the direct quotations from the interview and collating quotes under each of the detailed themes. This approach was adopted by Mitleton Kelly & Subhan (2002) who presented a narrative in a relatively “raw” format. When research interviews are written up in this way the reader is required to deeply engage with the material in order to make connections and conceptual links. The first draft of the narratives were written with a very light touch, but the research supervisors considered that this approach made considerable demands on the reader who was tasked with undertaking some analysis of the material to make conceptual links. In the circumstances the researcher developed a second set of narratives in a style that was influenced by Flyvbjerg (1998) and was more accessible. She added her own voice to discuss the material presented in the narratives but retained significant elements of the original interviews and adopted a fairly light touch to editing the material.

*Summary of methodological approach*

In this chapter, concepts from complexity and grounded theory have been considered as a way of developing a research strategy for this dissertation. The research methodologies by the selected complexity theorists and grounded theorists support qualitative inquiry. The choice of methods arises out of the nature of the research question which is focussed on identifying the factors influencing tourism policy from the perspective of the people who are involved in the practice of policy making. The research strategy that has been developed has been strongly influenced by grounded theory which has a methodological “fit” with questions about policy context.

A grounded approach will generate a significant volume of data, which though daunting is a major strength in terms of its potential to generate a richness of data to enhance knowledge from a ground level perspective. Whilst the study encompasses a number of
CHAPTER 6 LEEDS CASE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter provides background information about the case study area and the approach to tourism policy making in the area. Its main aim is to provide contextual information in order to enable the reader to understand the two narratives in Chapter 7. The chapter draws from a mix of primary and secondary research, including Council documents, committee minutes and local press reports. It identifies the broad economic and physical context of the City and the organisation and management of the Council. It then considers the nature of tourism in Leeds and the organisation and management of tourism in the City. It evaluates LCC’s involvement in tourism policy making in terms of its historical development identifying 5 phases and discussing the key characteristics of each phase. It examines the current local policy framework identifying specific policies and projects that affect tourism and then considers the regional and national structures and policies that shape the local approach.

Background

This case study outlines and evaluates LCC’s engagement in tourism service provision and policy making, since it first became involved in 1977. It considers tourism policy in terms of “fit” with other policies and functions, approaches to policy/plan making and the initiatives and physical developments that have occurred. A case study approach is adopted to "retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics" of tourism planning in Leeds (Yin 2003:1). The first part of the case study comprises historical analysis and outline of current policies and is developed from a mixture of primary and secondary sources collected between 1996 and 2005 using Council documents, policy documents, regional press reports and annual study visits. This chapter is informed by the findings of case study research by Buckley & Witt (1989) and two surveys investigating LAs involvement in tourism (Richards, 1991 and Stevenson & Lovatt 2001).
Description of place, economic, social and physical context

Leeds is an industrial city in the North of England and was identified by Buckley & Witt (1989) as a city in a “difficult area” to develop tourism. As traditional industries declined LCC has sought to diversify its employment base which has included work to develop and promote its image as a tourism destination. Leeds is the regional capital of Yorkshire and Humber and is the second largest Metropolitan District in England. It has a population of 717,000 and is the region’s largest employment centre. It claims to have the most diverse economy of any major city in the U.K. and over the past 20 years more jobs have been created in Leeds than any major city outside London (LCC, 2003). It is a city of rapid change attracting a number of large retail, office, leisure and cultural development schemes over the past 20 years to regenerate the waterfront and the City Centre.

Figure 3: Location Map: Source Lonely Planet
Organisation and management of the Council

Until 2000, LCC made policy decisions and delivered services through a series of Committees, reflected and supported by an officer/departmental structure. Since then, in accordance with changes in national legislation, it has adopted a cabinet structure as a basis for decision making. Under the 2000 arrangements the tourism manager was required to report to the Economic Development and Sustainability Scrutiny Board (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001) and in 2003 the tourism service was moved from the Leisure Services Department to the Development Department to reflect these reporting arrangements.

In the June 2004 local election, the Labour Party failed to gain a majority ending a twenty four year period of leadership (1980-2004). A coalition was formed between the Conservatives, Liberal Democrats and the Green Party who now lead the Council and make decisions about policy development and service delivery in the City. LCC’s plans and strategic “Vision for Leeds” remain unchanged but the new leadership of the LCC is committed to reducing public expenditure by 2 1/2 % per year for the next 3 years (Tebbut, 2005).

LCC has a long history of partnership working with the private sector. The most enduring partnership has been through the Leeds Initiative (LI) which was established in 1990 and in 2002 was accredited as the City’s Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in accordance with policy from national government (LI, 2003b). It is tasked with developing a strategic approach to guide the City’s long term economic, social and environmental development and brings together the public and private sector to develop the Vision for Leeds 1999-2009 and 2004-2020 and associated Strategies for the City (LI: 1999, 2003a). Figure 4 (overleaf) shows the organisational structure of the Council.

The tourism service was moved from the Directorate of Learning and Leisure in 2003 and now lies within the Development Directorate. In the current iteration of the organisational chart, tourism is not listed as a local service area.
LCC has engaged in tourism service delivery since the 1970’s and more recently in tourism policy making. This area of service is not one of the statutory responsibilities of LAs unlike housing, land use planning, transport, social services etc. Tourism services are provided at the discretion of the Council and the scope and nature of those services are not regulated in the same way as statutory services.

Figure 5 (overleaf) shows the organisations involved in the delivery of tourism policies, plans and services in Leeds. The three main groupings at the local level are the industry, partnerships and LCC. These ‘tourism’ groupings are not exclusively concerned with the delivery and development of tourism services and policy and span many areas of policy and service delivery i.e. planning has a remit that relates to all development not just tourism development. Figure 5 was produced by LCC in 2002 and
is an historical document in that the titles of many of the groupings identified have changed. In the narratives in Chapter 7 is clear that the industry is characterised by continuing change and its relationships are complex and evolving. The pace and nature of this change does not lend itself to representation in this way as the diagram is outdated before it goes to print. Rather than interpreting this diagram literally (representing a true picture of the organisations) it is useful to consider it as a "snapshot" which illustrates the number and variety of people with an involvement in tourism in Leeds in 2002. The names of some of the organisations have changed and will continue to change, as will the nature of their relationships with the Council.

Figure 5: Organisations with an interest in Tourism in Leeds (adapted from LCC Tourism Strategy for Leeds 2002:8)

Tourism in Leeds

The tourism industry has developed rapidly in the past 15 years and generated an estimated £735 million in 2000 towards the City's economy, an increase of 46% since 1997. The culture, leisure and tourism sector employs over 20,000 people and has
increased dramatically since the early 1990's supported by the development of hotels, attractions and leisure facilities. Tourism to Leeds grew by 30% in three years between 2000 and 2003 (LCC, 2003 & LI, 2003b). According to research in 2000 by the Yorkshire Tourist Board (YTB) there were

"1.43m staying trips generating an estimated £188.6m" or 26% of all visitor spending in Leeds and "18.4m visitor day trips to the city generating expenditure of £546m, accounting for 74% of tourism spend in the city" (LCC, 2003:117).

The City's profile as a destination has improved and it has won awards including 'The UK's Favourite City' (awarded by Conde Naste Traveller Magazine), 'Visitor City of the Year' (Good Britain Guide), the 'Number 1 City for Clubbing' (Mixmag Music Dance Awards) and 'Britain's Best City for Business' (Omis Research) (LCC, 2004).

**Markets**

Business visits accounted for around 41% of all tourism 'spend' in Leeds in 1999 and this sector was perceived to be the fastest growing market. The business market accounts for the relatively high occupancy rates in hotels in Leeds between Monday and Thursday and is supported by a conference office 'Conference Leeds' which is run by the Council (LI, 2002a).

Leisure visitors are predominantly from within the region and the numbers have remained relatively constant over the past 8 years with a drop in volume between 1997 and 1999 of 8% which is attributed to the closure of two of the City centre attractions, the City Museum and Tetley Brewery Wharf (LI, 2002a). The 6th Leeds City Centre Audit (LCCA), (LI, 2004) shows relatively constant figures since 1999, but numbers visiting the City centre attractions which includes the Royal Armouries, the City Art Gallery and the Henry Moore Institute have declined between 2001 and 2003.

In 1998 Leeds Leisure Services worked with hotel managers and nightclub operators to develop 'Clubbing Breaks'. These breaks received national media coverage and reinforced the image of Leeds as a lively city with an exciting nightlife, and a place for young people (LI, 2002a). Their success led to the development of new short breaks
themed around shopping, and sporting events and then in 2003 themed around cultural events, family and romantic breaks. The recent decision to diversify into so many markets appears to have diluted the message about Leeds as a short break destination and the LCCA (LI, 2004) notes that the demand for shopping and clubbing breaks fell in 2003 by 10% and 9% respectively.

The tourism product

The Tourism Strategy for Leeds TSL (LI, 2002a) identifies the increased investment in the City highlighting major projects such as the £42.5 million Royal Armouries Museum, the £12 million Millennium Square project and the £11.5 million Malmaison Hotel, which have all contributed to the image and product of the City. It identifies six major types of attractions in Leeds including; shopping and eating, nightlife, sightseeing, arts and culture, major events and sport. The LCCA (LI, 2004) identifies shopping as the City's principal visitor attraction, but also mentions the role of cultural events in promoting the City in the wider area. Leeds has an attractive and distinctive shopping environment, characterised by extensive pedestrianisation, Victorian covered arcades and markets and the Listed (Grade 1) Corn Exchange building. Over the past 10 years it has developed a café, bar and club culture which has been used to promote the City to the youth market.

Leeds is predominantly promoted on the basis of its urban and City centre attractions. The LA owns and manages attractions including the City Art Gallery, Abbey House Museum, Lotherton Hall and Estate, Temple Newsome, Tropical World in Roundhay Park, Kirkstall Abbey, Leeds Industrial Museum (Armley Mills) and Thwaite Mills. These attractions are predominantly promoted to residents and entrance is either free or at a nominal fee. It promotes these attractions through one booklet which is distributed via libraries, the TIC (called Gateway Yorkshire) and Council offices. Other attractions in Leeds include the Royal Armouries, the Henry Moore Institute and Thackray Medical Museum. These are promoted through websites, and publications available at Gateway Yorkshire (LI, 2002a and promotional leaflets 2001, 2002, 2003 & 2004).

A number of events are run within the City including the Leeds International Film Festival, the Carling Festival, Opera in the Park and the Leeds International Concert
Season. Sports events occur throughout the year in connection with Leeds United, Rugby League and Union and Cricket at Headingley. The West Yorkshire Playhouse, Opera North and the Northern Ballet are based in Leeds and attract a predominantly regional audience (LI, 2002a).

Roughly 80% of the accommodation stock in Leeds is provided within hotels or motels, the remaining 20% being provided in B&B, guesthouse and inns (LI, 2002a). In the last 15 years Leeds has experienced considerable growth in its stock of city centre hotels. At the beginning of 1989 there were six hotels in central Leeds. This increased by 1994 to ten hotels with 1,231 bedrooms (Jones Lang Wootton, 1995) and by 2004 to 21 hotels with 3036 bedrooms (LI, 2004). Over the period, accommodation demand has been derived predominantly from the business tourism sector, reflected by occupancy patterns that are characteristically higher during the week. The LCCA (LI, 2004) indicates that room yield increased on a yearly basis from 1996 to 2001 and that during these years mean occupancy exceeded 78%. Since 2001 the hotel market has experienced decline in terms of yield and occupancy rates and in 2003 the average occupancy rate was 73.6%. This is attributed to “substantial increases in hotel supply, with seven new hotels opening between 2002 and 2004” (LI, 2004:45). This trend is likely to continue with two new hotels currently under construction at Clarence Dock, planning permission having been granted for a further 5 hotels and another proposal under negotiation. If these developments proceed a further 1615 bedrooms will be created in the City centre (LI, 2004).

Despite the recent downward trend, research by consultants Panel Kerr Foster, envisages that hotel demand will continue to grow in Leeds and says that combined with an improvement in economic conditions in Britain, the “commercial developments planned for the City and an increase in quality hotel stock in Leeds could establish Leeds as one of the UK’s major hotel destinations” (LI, 2004:45).

Research

LCC has commissioned market research including trend analysis using the Cambridge Model in 1994, 1997 and 1999, attractions visitor surveys in 1994 and 1998 and a variety of one off surveys including Demograf analysis in 2000-1 and a travel trade survey in
History of Involvement in Tourism

The next section considers tourism activity in Leeds since 1977 when the City first became involved in tourism, and has been divided into five distinct phases of activity (Stevenson, 2005). The first 4 span the period 1977-1999 and evaluate the development of tourism policy making and service provision. In these 4 stages, the characteristics of LCC’s involvement in tourism service delivery and policy making are considered in terms of the organisation of tourism activities, priorities, formal plans, developments and initiatives. The fifth phase is the current phase and will be considered in more detail later in this Chapter.

Phase 1: Recognising the potential of Leeds as a destination 1977-1982

Organisation and priorities

LCC's first real involvement in tourism was in 1977 with the opening of a Tourist Bureau and the creation of the post of Director of Industrial and Commercial Development, Tourism and Promotions. (Yorkshire Evening Post (YEP) 14/5/1977 and Yorkshire Post (YP) 29/7/1977) The new Director quickly acted to highlight the potential of Leeds as a Tourist Centre and develop the Leeds Tourist Association (LTA), a partnership of LCC with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Taylor, 1978).

Formal plans, developments and initiatives

No formal plans were produced at this stage but the LTA took the role of promoting Leeds as a tourist and conference centre and advising the Council on policies to attract
tourists. It produced promotional brochures on the City and provided advice to the Council on the provision of tourism information services. The LTA raised the profile of tourism in Leeds and by the end of 1978 it was working with the Leeds Hotel Managers Association to prepare packages aimed at overseas tourists (Taylor:1978). In 1979 it started to consider the role of business tourism. It undertook a survey and announced that tourism brought £35 million 'profit' into the City each year (YP29/3/79 and YEP 5/9/79).

The LTA was dissolved in 1982, as it had been unable to attract a sufficient number of members and financial resources to operate. The failure to attract and maintain support from the private sector was attributed to businesses identifying no significant benefit from membership (YP 29/9/82:18).

The first phase was characterised by partnership working, a focus on promoting Leeds and developing new products, and research into the contribution of tourism to the Leeds economy. The emphasis was on relatively short-term promotional activities and developing new products and there was no overriding tourism marketing or development plan to guide activities. Private sector interests were focussed on short-term impacts and support waned when immediate benefits did not materialise.

Phase 2: Tourism service delivery by LCC 1983-1987

Organisation and priorities

When the LTA was dissolved LCC set up a working party to consider how to develop tourism in the future. The Council decided that it would deliver tourism information services itself and in 1983 a new post "Chief Music, Tourism and Promotions Officer" was created and awarded to an existing member of staff who had successfully headed the music programme (YP 12/11/82:22).

Formal plans, developments and initiatives

There are no formal tourism plans covering this period. The officer came into the post with a strong marketing focus, intending to market Leeds as "England's Northern
Capital" and focussing on promoting short breaks aimed at a younger market (YP 1/12 1983:8). He highlighted the need for an immediate increase in spending on tourism promotion but advised that the returns on this investment would probably not be immediate. In 1987 the officer resigned from his post and publicly criticised the LCC for not having "committed itself to the importance of tourism" and their "provincial arrogance that all is well and we don’t have to attract them (tourists)." He reported “the frustration of doing a vital job on a shoestring”, highlighting understaffing and a marketing budget of only £20,000 as major barriers to raising the profile of Leeds as a tourist centre (YEP 11/3/87:4).

In the second phase LCC delivered tourism services in-house, with a limited budget and a focus on marketing and promotional activities and linked to music events marketing.

**Phase 3: Tourism and regeneration 1987-1993**

**Organisation and priorities**

The third phase is marked by an emphasis on partnership and regeneration, with the creation of the Leeds Development Corporation (LDC) in 1987 and a partnership organisation the Leeds Initiative (LI) in 1990. The LDC was one of twelve Urban Development Corporations set up by National Government in the 1980’s with a remit to secure regeneration in derelict and underused former industrial areas (www.communities.gov.uk accessed 12/7/2006). The LI was developed as a local response to the need for partnership working and on the basis of the joint projects and negotiations undertaken by the LCC and the LDC. The LDC was seen by many as an essential catalyst in the regeneration and transformation of the southern tip of the City centre enabling the development of a strong commercial market. The LDC was not focussed on tourism led regeneration during its lifespan and leisure uses formed only 7% of its land investment (Hertzberg,1995). However it could be argued that the LDC created an environment which encouraged the development of partnership working and provided a basis for the creation of a Tourism Development Action Programme (TDAP).

The TDAP was set up in 1990 with the intention to develop tourism activity and expenditure through development, marketing and research on the land adjacent to the
waterways. TDAP’s were development orientated partnership programmes, conceived by national government and led by the English Tourism Board (ETB) and are discussed more generally in Chapter 4. The TDAP in Leeds comprised a partnership of the ETB, LCC, LDC, Yorkshire and Humberside Tourist Board (YHTB) and British Waterways (BW). The Leeds TDAP was set up for a fixed duration of 3 years during which the partners worked together to develop and implement a plan (BTA/ETB, 1991). The plan;

"was to have two anchor tenants Armouries at one end and Granary Wharf and a footpath and events along the front to create private sector interest" in the other waterfront sites (R2, 2005).

During this phase the tourism manager from nearby Bradford was appointed by LCC with the experience in successfully developing and promoting a neighbouring “difficult area” (Buckley & Witt, 1985) as a tourism destination in the 1980’s.

**Formal plans, developments and initiatives**

The TDAP produced two reports. The first in 1991 outlined its objectives to

1. “Strengthen and develop the quality and range of attractions and facilities.
2. Create integrated interpretation for the visitor…"
3. “Generate commercial interest in tourism on Leeds Waterfront.
4. To create an image for, and raise the tourism profile of Leeds Waterways through a well targeted marketing strategy and promotions programme” (BTA/ETB, 1991:14).

In order to achieve its objectives it commissioned feasibility studies on sites with tourism potential, established a marketing strategy and developed projects to improve information about and access to the waterways. The TDAP final report in 1993 highlighted some success in developing a proactive partnership approach. Initially there had been some problems with funding, with only half of the projected £107,000 contribution from the private sector having materialised by the halfway stage in 1992. However the final year projects achieved targets and generated a further £150,000 in cash or kind through a pump priming allocation of £50,000 (BTA/ETB1993).
In 1993 the LCC approved a report called *Towards a Tourism Development Strategy* which considered the development of local attractions, and trends in the local accommodation sector within the context of wider tourism trends and demonstrated how tourism would “produce dividends to the Leeds Economy” (1993:1). The report identified the rationale for a tourism development strategy, evaluated the local policy and organisational context of tourism and suggested mechanisms to develop and deliver the strategy. It was intended that this report would form the basis of a public consultation exercise after which a further report would be considered in July 1993 (LCC, Council Proceedings 22/2/1993). It is not clear what happened during the consultation, as there were no reports in the local press or minutes from the Council proceedings and the interviewees in 2004 and 2005 did not have a recollection of this report. However, between February and July 1993, the Council redefined the scope of its involvement in tourism to focus on promotional and marketing activities. The tourism service was reorganised into a new promotions and tourism unit within Leisure Services (LCC, 26/7/93) and the development part of the service was delivered by a tourism development consultancy provided by the YHTB (LCC, 13/8/93).

Several tourism developments were completed during this phase including the hotel ‘42-The Calls’ in 1991, a craft market ‘Granary Wharf’ in 1989 and the West Yorkshire Playhouse in 1990. A number of larger projects were instigated, including a project to create a new TIC called Gateway Yorkshire at the railway station and projects to develop attractions such as Tetley Brewery Wharf (a museum dedicated to the history of the pub), The Royal Armouries (the national museum of arms and armour) and Thackray Medical Museum (a museum of medical instruments and public health). During this phase a number of large hotel chains acquired and started to develop sites in Leeds.

The third phase was characterised by a focus on regeneration and the development of a specific tourism programme, the TDAP, with funding to develop and deliver tourism plans and initiatives. During this phase there was considerable confidence and enthusiasm for tourism development and activity as a means of enhancing the regeneration and redevelopment of Leeds’ redundant industrial areas. This confidence was reinforced by the decision to locate the Royal Armouries in Leeds which was
perceived to force "tourism towards the top of the City's agenda" as Leeds developed as a major centre for tourism (YP15/9/92:2).


Organisation and priorities

The development of 'Gateway Yorkshire' a new TIC reinforced the marketing and promotional role and remit of the LCC's, Tourism Service. Wider tourism development functions were carried out under the auspices of Economic Development, City Centre Management, Planning and Transport services in conjunction with the LI at a local level and by the YHTB at a regional level. The LI launched the City Centre Management Initiative (1998) to promote, market and manage the City Centre and to develop the waterfront and an all year entertainment programme (LI, 1999). This subsumed tourism marketing and development into the wider marketing and regeneration initiatives and narrowed the tourism service functions.

Formal plans developments and initiatives

In the fourth phase there was no formal tourism development strategy and tourism planning became enmeshed with other planning and policy functions. Tourism policies existed but were subsumed into wider regeneration, planning, development and city centre management plans. This phase was characterised by considerable tourism development activity arising partly from the initiatives and activities in the previous phase and partly due to market conditions in the period. New hotels were developed and several major tourism projects were realised including Tetley Brewery Wharf, (1994-8), the Henry Moore Institute in the Headrow (1994), 'Gateway Yorkshire' (1995) The Royal Armouries (1996) and Thackray Medical Museum (1997).

At the beginning of the phase there was optimism about the regeneration potential of tourism, and the development of new attractions and hotels. In 1996 Leeds won the "White Rose" award for the top tourism destination in Yorkshire (YEP:8/8/96) and in 1998 it was ranked as one of the top 4 visitor destinations in England (YEP:10/6/1998). However as the phase progressed several attractions experienced difficulties. Tetley
Brewery Wharf failed to attract enough visitors and closed in 1998 and Granary Wharf had limited success as craft market attraction. The Royal Armouries did not meet projected visitor number targets and was refinanced twice in 1997 and 1998. By 1999 Royal Armouries International (RAI) became insolvent with losses exceeding £10m and DCMS stepped to fund the running of the Museum (National Audit Office (NAO): 2001). The financial problems of the Armouries created high profile negative media coverage, which did little to enhance the image of Leeds. Also RAI was not in a position to develop the rest of the Clarence Dock Site during this phase, which meant that the Royal Armouries sat on its own surrounded by vacant sites.

Characteristics of Phases 1-4

Each of the phases is characterised by enthusiasm and energy at the beginning, followed by a setback, such as the end of a partnership (phase 1), the end of a programme (phase 3), the loss of a "champion" (phase 2) and the failure of a major project (phase 4). There is evidence of partnership working in the development and delivery of tourism services in all phases except phase 2. In phases 1 and 3 distinct tourism partnerships can be identified but in phase 4 tourism activities start to become subsumed into the wider policy making activities of the LI. The growth in partnership working over the four phases is supported by the findings of the RELAT Survey that showed LAs were increasingly working in partnerships with other organisations to carry out tourism activities (Stevenson & Lovatt 2001, Stevenson 2002, 2005).

The local policy framework (Phase 5: 1999- date)

Organisation and priorities

Since 1999 Council policy has been led by the Vision for Leeds (1999-2009 and 2004-2020), a community strategy to guide the social, economic and environmental development of the local area. The Vision is produced by the LI, the City’s Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in accordance with policy from national government (LI, 2003b & LCC 2003). The process of creating the Vision has developed a more collaborative approach to strategic planning by the Council, with a wide range of partners taking a more active role in developing and delivering policy. The creation of
the Vision has affected the LA's approach to tourism policy making and service delivery on the one hand by developing and adopting a distinct formalised tourism strategy in 2002 and on the other by developing tourism policies and objectives through a wide range of policies and plans.

Some uncertainty about future strategic priorities and objectives has arisen on the basis of a change in the political leadership of the Council. In the June 2004 local elections the Labour Party failed to gain a majority and a coalition was formed between the Conservatives, Liberal Democrats and the Green Party. Councillor Minkin, an influential "champion" of tourism lost her role as Deputy Leader and Development Portfolio Holder (Tebut, 2005). These uncertainties have been exacerbated by the resignation of the Tourism Manager in late 2004 and the decision to "freeze" the post for a year. A detailed account of the changes is included in the narratives in Chapter 7.

**Plans, policies and projects that affect tourism**

This section outlines the local policy framework identifying the local strategies, policies and plans that have a specific tourism element or that are perceived to impact on tourism in Leeds. These will be discussed and evaluated in order to assess how tourism objectives, relate to wider local policy. Then relevant strategies and plans at regional and national policy will be identified in order to consider the wider context in which policies are made. At the local level there are a number of plans and strategies which impact upon tourism planning that are developed under the auspices of the Vision for Leeds.

Figure 6 (overleaf) shows the relationship between the TSL (LI,2002a) and other strategies in Leeds. It has been developed by amalgamating information from two Vision documents (LI, 1999, 2003) and the Cultural Strategy (CS) (LI,2002b) and shows the relationships that are highlighted in these documents. At the top of the policy hierarchy is the "Vision for Leeds" which sets out the strategic direction of the Council. Beneath this lie seven "daughter" strategies, including the CS, which are linked together and are intended to deliver different aspects of the Vision. Below each of the daughter strategies are a lower layer of sub strategies or "grand-daughter" strategies. The TSL is one of the six grand-daughter strategies that lie below the CS. This framework implies communication from the bottom up as well as the top down but this is not apparent from
the interviews and therefore arrows have not been drawn on the diagram to denote two way communication.

Figure 6: The relationship between the TSL and other local strategies and plans

![Diagram showing the relationship between TSL and other local strategies and plans.]

Source: Adapted from diagrams The Vision For Leeds 1999-2009 and 2004-2020 and the Cultural Strategy 2002

Figure 6 shows a simplified picture of the relationship between tourism policy and other policies. Scrutiny of the detailed plans indicates that there are a number of other Council plans and strategies which impact upon tourism, some of which are “daughter” strategies such as the Leeds Economic Development Strategy and some of which have been developed outside the “visioning” process such as the Leeds Unitary Development Plan.
The relationships between these plans/strategies is complex and will be investigated in the following section of this chapter and in the narratives.

*The Vision*

The first Vision (1999) identifies 6 strategic agendas outlining broad objectives which include community opportunity, neighbourhoods, transport, environment, economy and technology. The role of tourism is not explicitly mentioned and there are no objectives that relate to attracting visitors to the City or developing it as a destination. The current Vision was formally approved by the Council in March 2005 and has three main aims which are:

- "Going up a league as a city " in terms of its international reputation, and the quality of life of its residents.
- "Narrowing the gap" between disadvantaged communities and the rest of the city
- "Developing Leeds’ role as the regional capital" (LI, 2003:21).

The first and third of these aims could be perceived as having a link with tourism policy, however tourism is not explicitly discussed and the intent of these policy objectives in respect of visitors is unclear.

The Vision identifies 12 major project areas, one of which is "improving the image of the city". This project outlines specific tourism aims, which include to be "the best city to visit in the U.K." and "the preferred city for hosting national, European and International Events" as its fifth objective (LI, 2003:32). Another project "improving the cultural life of the city" does not mention tourism or visitors explicitly, but identifies specific development projects which are likely to impact on visitor numbers to Leeds i.e. developing a large scale international cultural facility, developing an arts quarter, restoring the Grand Theatre and creating the City Museum.

The Vision also identifies eight themes, two of which have a tourism aspect. Under the "Cultural Life" theme it says that Leeds will;
"promote Leeds as a major city for its cultural and heritage attractions", "market the city's festival, organisations, attractions and events", and that it will "create first class cultural facilities...such as an arena, conference centre or concert hall" (LI, 2003:36&37).

Under the “Enterprise and the Economy” theme it says that Leeds will;

"expand the leisure and business tourism sector within the city centre and develop Leeds cultural attractions" and "develop a marketing strategy for Leeds to promote the city, nationally and internationally" (LI, 2003:41).

At a LA wide level, tourism appears to have a relatively low priority. Although a number of projects and policies with tourism implications are identified in the Vision, the word "tourism" is only used once. Specific tourism priorities are not identified and targets are not set for tourism activity.

Daughter strategies

The two strategies which appear to have the most direct relationship and impact upon tourism are the CS (LI, 2002b) and Leeds Economic Development Strategy (LCC, 2000). The CS is focussed on the needs of residents and does not set specific objectives which relate to tourism. However its definition of culture includes a list of 10 activities one of which is tourism and all of which have implications and impacts for tourism and the tourism industry in the city. The CS encompasses a wide range of activities and is supported by six lower level strategies (see figure 4). The status of the CS is evidenced by the intense activity and substantial investment in cultural projects and initiatives with £100m investment in culture and leisure planned over next 5 years (LCC, 2003:117).

The Leeds Economic Development Strategy 2000 identifies key policy areas relating to the status and competitiveness of the city, inclusion of all communities and partnership. Tourism policies are included under the "regional centre and cosmopolitan city" policy area and aim to;
"Develop and promote Leeds as a leading business, cultural, shopping and tourist centre ... Increase leisure and business tourism to Leeds including the exploration of opportunities for sustainable tourism... (and) Develop Leeds' cultural attractions, industries and infrastructure" (LCC, 2000:22).

At the daughter strategy level there is evidence that the City has some aspirations around its status as a destination, and its tourism industry. Whilst tourism is mentioned explicitly within these strategies, it should be noted they relate to a diverse range of activities within the City and include a broad range of objectives. Tourism forms only a very minor part of these strategies and is expressed at a low level i.e. it is not a headline policy area.

**Grand-daughter strategies**

Below the "daughter" strategies are a number of sub strategies which are also called "daughter" strategies. During this study the sub strategies will be referred to as "grand-daughter" strategies to clarify their status and position in the hierarchy.

The TSL outlines the vision for tourism.

"Within the next five years Leeds will become known nationally and internationally as a dynamic friendly and cosmopolitan European city. Already established as a premier business and shopping destination, Leeds will become a 24 hours city, characterised by a vibrant nightlife, and so much to see and do that a return visit will be a must" (LI, 2002a:17).

It has nine aims; three relate to marketing and marketing intelligence, two relate to sustainable development/management and are focussed on integrated transport and environmental improvement, two aim to improve communication by developing ICT and partnership working, one relates to quality enhancement and one to business support. Under seven of these nine aims, specific issues are identified and targets are set.

It identifies a vast array of organisations to lead the implementation of initiatives in connection with these targets. Implementation requires extensive partnership activity,
and a different grouping of partners is identified in connection with each target. Many of these initiatives are also outlined in other strategy documents and are led by other parts of the organisation such as LI, the Leeds Development Agency, the Chamber of Commerce, the corporate centre of the Council and the Universities. These projects are often not conceptualised as tourism projects when they appear in other documents i.e. the target to explore the feasibility of a major purpose built conference or exhibition centre is conceptualised in terms of broad economic development and City Region objectives.

The implementation of tourism policy within these seven areas is complex and lacks clarity, with key parts being delivered by other parts of the Council or by other organisations. The dimensions and implementation of policy around the sustainable development objectives of the plan are unclear as there is no discussion about these aims and no targets are identified. In theory a Tourism Forum reports to the Cultural Partnership (CP) on the implementation of the tourism strategy. However it is clear in the narratives in Chapter 7 that the Tourism Forum is not a member of the CP, does not report on implementation and that the CP are unaware of its activities.

The TSL is presented in a different style to the other strategies in that it provides considerable evidence to justify the involvement of the LA in tourism and is less promotional (has fewer headlines) than many of the other strategies. It provides an overview of the tourism product, including a SWOT analysis, and identification of the key organisations affecting tourism at the local level and some discussion of the strategic influences on tourism in the area. The strategy focuses on communicating the potential role of tourism in the City and its fit with other initiatives. The approach and style of the strategy appears to stem from the non-statutory nature of tourism and the lack of formalised policy in this area before 2002. The TSL is focussed towards providing evidence to justify LCC’s involvement in tourism and to raise the profile of tourism as an area of Council activity.

Other local policies

In addition to the Vision, tourism policy is expressed within a number of other statutory Council plans. The UDP (LCC,2001), is LCC’s statement of land use planning policy
relating to the area. In respect of tourism it is framed positively and identifies the scope for the development of tourism. It refers to the complex nature of the relationship between visitors and the environment and the need to balance different interests to achieve a "sustainable level of tourism" (LCC, 2001: 211). Specifically it supports the retention and enhancement of existing attractions, the development of new cultural and sporting facilities, a conference/exhibition centre or concert facilities. It specifies that the land around Elland Road is reserved for leisure and tourism uses and identifies 6 other major sites where tourism and leisure uses are supported. The UDP contains policies on hotel development, supporting a wide range of visitor accommodation particularly 4 and 5 star, and where it is linked to the regeneration of the riverside.

The UDP was reviewed in 2004 but no amendments were made to the tourism or hotel policies. The planning system is currently undergoing major change through the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the UDP will be replaced by a new plan called a local development scheme (LCC:2003). It is not clear what the emerging policies are on tourism but the interviews with officers indicate that it is unlikely that there will be any major changes to existing policies.

LCC sets out its corporate objectives within the Corporate Plan 2005-8 which identifies seven strategic outcomes. Most of these are focussed on the needs of local residents and the standards and style of service delivery of services. One of these outcomes is related to Leeds as a competitive, international city but the tourism aspects of this outcome are not discussed explicitly.

Marketing Leeds (ML) is the organisation tasked with developing and delivering a marketing strategy for the City and has developed from the City Image Initiative which formed a part of the Vision 2004-7. Whilst there is no formal documentation about the objectives of ML at present, the need for a coordinated and resourced marketing strategy for the City has been identified in a wider variety of Council documents.

"Therefore the strengths of the local economy, the distinctiveness of the city centre, the range of cultural infrastructure, facilities and events, and the wider quality of life all need to be communicated widely beyond the city-region"(LI, 2003b:24).
The narratives in Chapter 7 identify a lack of clarity around the relationship between ML and tourism marketing but it is clear that the development of this high profile and relatively well financed initiative has focussed attention away from the objectives set out in the tourism strategy.

Current projects

There are a number of regeneration projects which have implications for tourism in the City but these are identified and discussed in terms of the wider economy. Projects with tourism implications include the development of a museum, the Private Finance Initiative bid to improve the Art Gallery, a new arts centre and civic theatre, a new International Cultural Festival to mark the UK European Cultural Capital Year in 2008, the renovation of attractions including Temple Newsome, Roundhay Park and Kirkstall Abbey, the development of South Leeds Stadium as sports venue and developments in the cultural quarter in Quarry Hill including a dance centre and an International Hotel. The Vision (LI, 2003a) states a commitment to developing an "international" cultural facility such as a concert hall, arena, exhibition or conference facility and a feasibility study was completed in August 2005 and recommends the development of an arena by the Council and a private sector partner. The provision of the facilities outlined above will impact on the nature and scale of tourism in the City. (LCC, 2003, LI, 2003a and LI, 2005b)

The context for local policy

National policy for tourism is delivered through a number of departments. The lead department is DCMS, which delivers tourism marketing via an agency called Visit Britain. Policy activities that impact on tourism are currently delivered through the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) since May 2006, and Dept for Trade and Industry (DTI), Department for Transport (DfT) and Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). A characteristic of the organisational structure at national level is the frequent change of the titles and functions of departments. The historical analysis in Chapter 4 outlined the changes in the agencies tasked with the delivery of tourism services and the departmental affiliations of tourism. This organisational restructuring and renaming is
also occurring in other areas for example land use planning activities have moved from the Department of the Environment (DOE) to the Department of Transport and the Regions (DETR), to the Office of the Deputy (ODPM) and since May 2006 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

**National and regional organisations/structures**

Figure 7: Organisations/Departments making policy that impacts on tourism

National Level

- DCMS - marketing
- DfT - transport planning
- DCLG - land use planning
- DTI - economic planning
- DfES - training
- DEFRA - rural policy

Regional Level

- Core Cities and City Region (cross RDA boundaries)
- RDA's i.e. Yorkshire Forward - Tourism policy devolved to the regions
- Regional Tourist Boards
- Northern Way (linked policy making by 3 RDA's)

The Regional Development Agencies Act (1998) enabled RDA's to be established and in 1999 eight RDA's were launched with a remit to further the economic development and regeneration of their areas, promote business efficiency, promote employment, enhance skills and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In 2002 the RDA's remit was extended to include transport, planning and housing and in 2003 it was extended again to include tourism, (LCC 2003). In the Yorkshire and Humber region a range of organisations develop policy including YF, the RDA who are responsible for the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), allocate funding to the YTB and have a role in developing the tourism strategy; the YTB who are involved in the day to day development and delivery of the Regional Tourism Strategy; the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly (YHA) who are responsible for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and an array of partnership organisations who develop and deliver policy at different scales in the region i.e. the Northern Way, covering 3 regions and the West Yorkshire Partnership at the sub regional level. This multifaceted and multi agency approach to developing policy has raised concerns about the "many ambiguities about their (the RDA's) roles within an evolving system of governance" and that the "RDA's may merely create

**National and regional policy**

The development and delivery of tourism policies at local level is influenced by a wide range of initiatives and policies developed at the national and regional level. During the period of this study the national and regional policy framework has been characterised by considerable change. The creation of RDA's in 1998 has resulted in the rapid development of regional policy. In Yorkshire, YF and the YHA are currently engaged in developing updated versions of the RSS and the RES and the policy arena is characterised by several iterations of policy as it is emerges and changes. The rapid pace of change means the major regional policies are articulated in several different documents which leads to uncertainty and lack of clarity (discussed further in Chapter 7).

The complexity and dynamism of the policy framework is illustrated in Figures 8 and 9, the former which illustrates the policy framework for tourism policy development in Leeds in 2002 at the outset of this study and the latter, which illustrates the policy framework in July 2006 as this study came to a close. These figures demonstrate the extent of change over the study period with the only constants in wider policy making such as the Local Government Act (2000) and the Regional Development Agencies Act (1998) leading to a range of initiatives and policies at the local level. The policies that are unchanged at the local level have generally become integrated into wider strategies (such as the CS) or appear to have become moribund (TSL).

**National and regional tourism policy**

In 2003 a Select Committee on Culture Media and Sport (CMS Committee) reported on the challenges faced by the tourism sector in keeping tourism high on the governments agenda. It referred to tourism as the “Cinderella of government” (2003:28) noting “the government is not providing an adequate support structure for the tourist industry”, the severe “under-funding for tourism in England” and particular concerns that the organisational arrangements for tourism might be “just a more complicated way of cutting the same funding cake” (House of Commons, 2003:28).
Figure 8: Formal strategies, plans and initiatives that impact upon tourism policy in Leeds 2002
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LOCAL LEVEL
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Other Local Plans and Strategies
- Unitary Development Plan (2001)
- Arts and Heritage Strategy
- City Centre Management Initiative Strategic Plan
- International Leeds Strategy
- Recreation Strategy
- Strategy for sustainable development
Figure 9: Formal strategies, plans and initiatives that impact upon tourism policy in Leeds 2006 (changes in italics)

NATIONAL LEVEL

- Tomorrows Tourism Today 2004

REGIONAL LEVEL

- Regional Econ Strategy 2003-12 (consultation draft 2006-15)
- Regional Planning Strategy 2004 (& emerging documents)

LOCAL LEVEL

- Vision for Leeds 2004-20
- Corporate Plan (2005-8)

- Cultural Strategy (2002)

Source: Adapted from TSL 2002: 7
Since then an updated national strategy has been published *Tomorrow's Tourism Today 2004* (TTT) and is focussed around 4 main areas which are marketing, e-tourism, the quality of tourism products and skills and data. This strategy sets the context for LA intervention and involvement in tourism;

"LAs continue to perform vital functions in supporting the tourism industry - not least because of their statutory duties, and their wider responsibilities for local infrastructure, economic development and sense of place. LAs are well placed to perform the essential functions of coordinating all aspects of tourism at local level, working in partnership with businesses and other interests, including Regional Development Agencies (RDA's) and their delivery partners" (DCMS, 2004:14).

TTT encourages LAs to devote resources to marketing activities, and provide information through TIC's. However it clearly outlines that these activities are a discretionary element of LA service provision i.e. LAs do not have to engage in tourism service provision or policy making. It also outlines the reforms to the organisational structures that support the tourism industry, including the creation of Visit Britain, the national marketing organisation, and the devolution of tourism functions to the RDA's (DCMS, 2004).

Despite the new TTT, the Tourism Alliance (TA) have identified a number of persistent problems relating to the organisational structures and funding arrangements for tourism policy making and service provision. Their annual report 2005 highlights key areas where further action is required by government. Of particular interest to this study are the recommendations to establish "coherent" structure for tourism, improve tourism statistics, and increase investment for tourism marketing (TA, 2005).

At the regional level tourism strategy has emerged during the research period. At the start of this study regional tourism policy was articulated through the *Yorkshire and Humber Tourism Action Plan (2002)* which clearly related to the RES. This policy was reviewed in the *Action Plan Review 2004*. During this period the strategic role for tourism policy was devolved to the regions and YF commenced a major restructuring programme which focussed on the delivery of tourism services via sub-regional
Destination Management Organisations (DMOs). The main policy document relating to the re-organisation of tourism in the region is *A New Tourism Delivery Structure for Yorkshire and the Humber (2004)*. The response to this proposal is discussed further in Chapter 7.

In 2005 YF produced a consultation version of *A Strategic Framework for Tourism and the Visitor Economy* and engaged in discussion with stakeholders. Policy is currently articulated through two new documents, *Bold Vision – Bright Future*, the Tourism Marketing Strategy (2006-2010) and "*A Strategic Framework for Tourism and the Visitor Economy*" (2006). The former is specifically focussed on marketing approaches and targets for the region including strengthening the Yorkshire brand. The strategic framework is drafted in the context of the RES and sets out to “summarise the key issues for the visitor economy” (2006:2). This strategy presents analysis of market trends, identifies priority areas including sustainable tourism, innovation and product development, quality, business development and skills, improving the information base and market intelligence, improving visitor services and marketing. It sets detailed targets against each objective and identifies an action plan, outlining the lead agency and timing of specific initiatives. There are several interesting differences between the two documents, the first is the decision to swap the position of the sustainable development and marketing moving sustainable development forward in the document. The second is the decision to remove the word tourism from much of the document and to use the term “the visitor economy”. These developments will not be considered further in this research but it is intended to investigate them in the post PhD stage of the research.

*Wider policies and plans that affect tourism*

Strategic policy making in LAs is guided by the Local Government Act 2000 which requires LAs, in partnership with other bodies, to prepare long term community strategies to improve the economic, social and environmental well being of their areas. In Leeds, this is implemented through the LI who have developed a wide-ranging strategic vision for the City involving the local community (LCC, 2003). The TSL (LI, 2002a) has been formally adopted during the process of developing the Vision and is one of the Councils lower order or granddaughter strategies.
The relationship between tourism and land use planning is overstated in the literature (see Chapters 2 and 4) and is extremely complex in the context of this study. Planning guidance from national government relating to tourism has undergone changes in the past couple of years. In the past this was provided in planning policy guidance (PPG's) which are gradually being replaced by planning policy statements (PPS's). PPG21 (1992) provided guidance on tourism development until 2003 when it was cancelled on the basis that it overlapped with other PPG's particularly PPG 6 (town centres), PPG 7 (the countryside and rural economy), PPG13 (transport), PPG 2 (green belts) and PPG 17 (open space sport and recreation). Whilst it is apparent that reviews of other PPG's have recognised tourism, it is often implicit within wider policy. The ODPM recommended that Good Practice Guidance be issued on tourism when PPG21 was revoked but the development of this guidance has been subject to lengthy delays and "a fraught process, with ODPM parting company with the initial consultants and the project being taken back in-house" (TA, 2005:8). As a result of these problems the “Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism” was not published until May 2006 and there was no clear guidance from National Government on tourism planning in 2004 and 2005 when primary research was carried out for this study.

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 led to major changes in the land use planning system replacing Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) with RSS and Local and UDPs with Local Development Schemes. At the regional level this presents a complicated situation because the new legislation came into force when the YHA had almost completed the lengthy process of updating RPG12 under the previous legislation from Central Government (YHA, 2003). The new plan, the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber, was published in 2004, was intended to cover the period between 2004-2016. However changes in the national legislation meant that work began to revise it, in accordance with the new legislation, before this strategy was published. To date three project plans have been produced during 2004 and 2005 to update the strategy. The targets for the preparation of the new RSS have been delayed on the basis that the YHA are required "to take account of the Northern Way and also to achieve broad alignment in the timing and submission dates for draft RSSs in all three
northern regions" (YHA, 2005:3). A timetable for the revised RSS has now been produced and the final version is scheduled for late 2007.

The adopted RSS (YHA, 2004) has four themes relating to economic regeneration and growth, social inclusion, urban and rural renaissance, and conserving/enhancing natural resources. The RSS has one policy that directly relates to tourism in mixed use urban areas like Leeds and advises

"In preparing development plans, local transport plans and rights of way improvement plans, local authorities should have due regard to the importance of tourism to the Regions economy and to its potential to assist economic and environmental regeneration and should include policies which enable tourism to develop in an integrated and sustainable way..." (YHA, Policy E6, 2004:68).

It also contains transport policies but the tourism transport policies are focussed on traffic measures for rural tourist attractions and are not directly relevant to the study. The emerging RSS includes topic paper on sustainable tourism that provides lists of broadly framed recommendations for action at the regional and sub-regional level. This paper has been developed by consultants and does not reflect political complexities in delivering integrated tourism services and policy in the region that are discussed in the narratives in Chapter 7 (YHA, 2004).

Regional Economic Strategy (RES)

Chapter 4 highlights the links between tourism policy making and the economy. The RES is undergoing rapid change and development at present with three published versions of the strategy, two which are fully approved and cover 2001-2010, 2003-2012 and one which has been published in draft form and covers 2006-2015. The 2006 version outlines its objectives under six main headings; more businesses, competitive businesses, skilled people, connecting people to good jobs, transport, infrastructure and environment and stronger cities and discusses progress since the first RES was adopted in 2001. Tourism is not mentioned in the main text of the document which has a broader economic and regeneration focus however in Annex 1 the document outlines linkages to other key topics and strategies identifying the link between the economy, tourism and
culture. The information in the annex outlines the significance and potential of tourism to the regional economy, and the hierarchy of policy with the RSS providing "the overall direction for tourism which is fully detailed and actioned though the region's 'Strategic Framework for the Visitor Economy'" (YF, 2006:122). The most recent version of the RES states that "tourism interventions will be embedded across the RES" (YF, 2006:122). One of the implications of embedding tourism policy is that the tourism implications of broad economic objectives and policies are not explicitly addressed in the Strategy.

Initiatives to improve collaboration and performance in the Region.

There are a number of initiatives that have been developed by central government with the intention of improving collaboration and economic performance across the region. These policies have resulted in regional partnerships and policies being developed. The picture of policy making at the regional level is very complex because the boundaries of these regional initiatives have been drawn up differently and they have resulted in different layers and configurations of regional policy. Appendix 6 illustrates various regional boundaries.

The Northern Way comprises the three northern RDA's and has developed strategy Moving Forward: the Northern Way 2004 to bridge the productivity gap between the North and the rest of the UK. The strategy highlights the importance of the City Regions in accelerating economic growth and each of the City Regions has prepared a City Region Development Programme outlining their contribution to improving the economic performance of the North. This outlines a series of strategic objectives one of which is to market the North to the world. A specific target has been set to:

"increase the number of overseas tourist visits to the North by 20% to 3.5 million by 2008, against a baseline average of 2.9m visitors per year from 1999 to 2002, with a further increase to 4.5m visits by 2015" (LI, 2005a:62).

In 2002 the ODPM developed the Core Cities Initiative, a joint working group with eight "core cities" including Leeds, in order to make recommendations to enable the major regional cities to strengthen economic competitiveness of regions. Following on from this the LI produced its interim prospectus Leeds: the Business City (2003b) which aims
to achieve further dialogue between City and region about economic growth potential and develop collaboration. This prospectus specifically mentions tourism saying:

"Business tourism has always been a significant sector in Leeds and the long term potential exists to develop the city’s position as a centre for international business events and conferences. However fulfilling this ambition relates closely to the development of new facilities in the city" (LI, 2003b:24).

It identifies six success factors or themes, three of which are relevant to tourism; “Creating a city centre of European distinctiveness”, “Developing a cultural infrastructure of national and international reputation” and “Developing the city’s international image and profile.”(LI, 2003b:15). Following the publication of its interim prospectus a City Region Partnership was established in November 2004 and has developed its vision to;

"work together differently: to develop an internationally recognised City Region; to raise our economic performance; to spread prosperity across the whole of our City Region and to promote a better quality of life for all of those who live and work here" (LI, 2005a:5).

In the short term the City Region intends to improve mobility within the region, produce a portfolio of investment opportunities to influence location decisions and develop partnerships across the region. In the longer term the key themes relate to improving communications; encouraging innovation and developing skills; developing business infrastructure; supporting key growth sectors and promoting the City Region (LI, 2005a:6) Each of the key themes has the potential to affect tourism policy making and planning at the local level but tourism is not specifically identified as a growth sector in the plan. The plan identifies tourism attractions, culture and environmental quality as one of its assets. It also identifies economic challenges which include poor connectivity (public transport is specifically mentioned but the idea of improving connections more generally is introduced), economic inactivity and skills shortages.
Summary

This chapter has identified a plethora of strategies, policies, plans and initiatives at the local, regional and national level that impact upon tourism planning and policy making in Leeds. Tourism policy making is characterised by its complexity and it is difficult to identify its boundaries as it is articulated through a range of plans and strategies.

At the local level tourism policy has a relatively low status within the policy hierarchy of the local strategic planning process (illustrated in Figure 6). In 2004 the tourism manager had a low status within the organisation which impacted upon her ability to influence key policy makers in other service areas and other partners in the development and delivery of tourism policy. In 2005 the tourism manager’s role had been amalgamated with the Inward Investment manager’s role. During the research period, tourism is a weak partner in any partnership negotiations and is not represented in a number of relevant partnership groups. The non-statutory nature of the tourism service has major implications on the resources available for the service, the extent and nature of research and the approach to developing policy. Tourism policy is expressed in a tourism strategy but some tourism planning and policy functions also appear to have been subsumed into a variety of policies and plans. This means that it is difficult to define and assess the extent of nature of policy making and monitoring in the City. The tourism team appear to be focussed on providing direct “front-line” services such as running the TIC and conference desk.

At a regional level, tourism strategy is developed by a number of different organisations working within different boundaries. Policy development at the regional level is made more complex due to the array of organisations, the differences in boundaries between different national and regional initiatives and the pace of change with new initiatives constantly emerging throughout the research process. Policy making at the national level has also been characterised by rapid change and continuing transition. This has led to a lack of clarity about the role for LAs in respect of a broad ranging and sustainable tourism planning or policy function and will be discussed further in Chapters 7 and 8.
CHAPTER 7 THEMATIC NARRATIVE: THE FACTORS INFLUENCING TOURISM POLICY IN LEEDS

Introduction

This chapter considers tourism policy making in Leeds, initially focussing on the local level and the specific problems within the tourism service. It explores the relationship between tourism policy and wider policy; the extent and nature of communication between tourism policy makers and other interests; and the nature of changes in the local policy environment and identifies key themes. The study widens to consider the nature of regional tourism policy, its relationship with local policy, the communication between local and regional policy makers and the changes in the regional policy environment. Finally it draws together the characteristics identified at the local and regional level and discusses these in terms of their implications on local tourism policy.

It is presented as two narratives which are written up in chronological order. The first narrative is based on seven interviews in April and May 2004. Six with councillors and officers involved in policy making at the local level and one with an officer at the regional level. Responses have been coded to protect the identity of the interviewees. The code identifies whether the interviewee is located at the local (L) or regional (R) level. The second narrative is based upon eight interviews in May 2005. Six were with councillors and officers at local level and two with officers at regional level. In 2005, interviewees were selected on the basis of the themes emerging from the first stage interviewees. This combined with a change in the leadership of LCC, the decision to “freeze” the tourism management post at local level for a year and not to appoint a tourism manager at regional level until the new financial year and meant that five “new” sources were interviewed.

The decision was made prior to the 2005 interviews, to select interviewees on the basis of theoretical sampling, which was directed by themes categories and emerging theory (Goulding, 2002; Glaser 1978,1992). The changes in personnel are not considered to have adversely impacted on the research and indeed, have added more breadth to the analysis, bringing more people into the study. It was not difficult to select interviewees for the second stage interviews and the field was widened to include several people who
had been identified by the interviewees in 2004 and three people who had taken over key roles in the past 12 months.

Narrative 1: 2004

**Problems faced by the tourism service**

The tourism service provides a broad range of functions that span product development, tourism policy/strategy, marketing, running the conference desk and the TIC (L1, L4 and L6). There is little criticism about the service or identification of any specific problems at the local level but at the regional level there is concern that the service lacks a business focus, has inadequate data systems and does not undertake adequate monitoring and research within its TIC. The lack of monitoring is perceived as "a massive lost opportunity" by R1 as the tourism service is not collecting information about visitors to the TIC and their requirements. The Region and City do not have a destination management system, which means they are unable to be proactive in marketing or managing the destination. Leeds does not have on-line booking facilities that are offered by many competitor cities. R1 claims that LCC lacks a "dynamism", "nous and entrepreneurialism" which leads to poor quality services and attractions. L6 says that Leeds lacks tourism infrastructure including a major conference venue or arena and a dedicated coach park facility.

**Relationship between tourism policy and wider Council policy**

The City faces a range of issues which arise from the need to deliver a broad range of services and develop policies on tight budgets, to nationally agreed standards. In 2004 interviewees rarely talked directly about tourism policy in Leeds and framed their responses in the context of wider Council policy. All interviewees emphasise that tourism policy should not be viewed on its own and should be understood in its wider context. They identify four key plans/strategies with a tourism aspect; the Vision for Leeds, ML, regeneration policy and the CS.

The idea that tourism policy "is not separated out from the overall thrust of policy in the City" (L 2) is interesting as a separate tourism strategy document exists (TSL) with
distinct but linked objectives to other policies. The TSL (LI, 2002a) is explicitly linked to some policies and implicitly linked to others (Figures 6 and 8 in Chapter 6). A quote from one local interviewee outlines the complex range of relationships between tourism policy making and wider policies and the lack of clarity of those relationships.

“There is still very strong links between (tourism and)... arts... yet obviously with all the economic aspects it still has lots to do with planning and so it makes a great deal of sense for it to be there. But how that should also fit in with marketing the City generally... and then how it all fits into the Leeds Initiative, and how Leeds image should be promoted” (L3).

Five of the six local interviewees (L1, L2, L3, L4 & L6) discussed the Vision for Leeds in relation to tourism. The Vision has three main objectives, two of which have implications on tourism policies and the way it is delivered in Leeds. These are “Going up a league” and “Developing Leeds’ role as the regional capital” (LI2004:21) (discussed in more detail in Chapter 6). The relationship between the Vision and tourism policy is not explicitly outlined in either document but interviewees make links. They say “tourism is an important part of Leeds playing a wider regional role” (L4). It

"... has a fundamental role to play in “going up a league” the number of tourists can be an indicator of whether you are going up a league. Where are you getting tourists from might be a pretty good indicator of whether your name is getting out there” (L2).

“There is this going up a league – Leeds becoming a European City ... that must involve tourism being a bigger player than it has been” (L3).

L1, L2, L3 and L4 consider that the objective to go up a league and become a regional City are linked and L3 suggests that Leeds has more to offer the tourist in the context of the region than on its own.

“We have more chance of going up a league if we see ourselves as part of a region opposed to just sitting on its own... if we think of ourselves as part of a region... then we have got something that I think is extremely attractive” (L3).
L2 indicates that tourism policies have been a fundamental part of marketing the City in the past. Several interviewees including L1 and L4 refer to the results of the Brahm Report (research into peoples’ perceptions of Leeds). The Brahm Report has highlighted problems in terms of the City’s image and clearly raises questions about the effectiveness of marketing initiatives that have been developed by different parts of the Council. The key finding of this report was that;

“Leeds hasn’t got a particularly high profile within the rest of the country and moreover internationally ...if you haven’t (been to Leeds) then its not that you have a negative perception it is that you don’t have one at all” (L4).

The findings of the Brahm Report have resulted in the development of ML which is charged with developing a coordinated marketing strategy for the City. L1, L2 and L4 consider ML is likely to integrate tourism marketing with wider marketing initiatives in the City and perceive tourism policy within the context of this wider initiative.

L4 and L5 perceive a relationship between tourism and urban regeneration with the potential of tourism to bring investment into the City and particularly into its waterfront areas. Tourism policy has had very strong links with regeneration policy in the past (Phase 3) and on the basis that the tourism team is now located in the department which has a remit for regeneration it is interesting that only these two interviewees perceive that regeneration policy and tourism policy are linked in 2004.

In terms of the policy hierarchy, tourism has a clear link to the CS (see Figure 6 in Chapter 6 of the case study). L1 identifies the links between tourism and culture and highlights the cultural infrastructure needed to “go up a league” including “a concert hall, an arena, an exhibition centre or a conference centre” (L1). It is interesting that this infrastructure is identified as “cultural” rather than “tourism” although it would be likely to have a major impact on tourism in the City. L1 recognises that the improvement of the cultural infrastructure has implications on tourism but this is seen as a positive “spin-off” of policy rather than a central element of it.
Characteristics of the relationship between tourism and other service areas

The next section will consider the characteristics of the relationship between the tourism service and its policies and other services and wider policies focussing on its low status and lack of clarity.

Low status

The interviewees identify a number of explanations of the low status of tourism in comparison with other service areas. These are;

1. low status arising from tourism being a non-statutory service area;
2. the tourism manager is too low in the Council structure to be influential and her team is small with a minimal budget;
3. there is lack of interest and pressure from the public for the LA to be active in providing tourism services and;
4. as a consequence there is a lack of political priority at the local level.

Interviewees including L1, L6 and R1 highlight that tourism is a non-statutory service, which means that there is no requirement that LAs engage in tourism policy making activities or provide tourism services. "Tourism is non statutory, therefore it is cuttable from the budget at any time" (R1). Tourism is competing with statutory service areas for money i.e. with services that the LA is obliged to provide.

"The Council has got a limited budget... education, social services, emptying the bins and cleaning the streets – most of the money goes into that... To say we will take a million pounds out of those services to put into, say tourism or marketing, it is not an easy decision to take. In reality you will never, ever get the politicians to do that... It will always be a dilemma" (L1).

The low status of tourism in the LA is demonstrated by the size of the tourism team and the relatively low position of the manager of that team in the hierarchy of the organisation. L1 comments that the tourism manager has a small team with a small budget. L3 indicates that the tourism manager is largely unsupported by managers or
Councillors at higher levels of the organisation when he comments that the nature and extent of the Council's involvement is "down pretty largely to (the tourism manager)" (L3). R1 comments that the tourism manager "is restricted by the fact that she is not more senior" (R1).

The problem that tourism managers do not have the power to influence key decision makers is not a Leeds phenomenon and exists at a wider level in LAs in the Yorkshire and Humber Region.

"...the people who are involved in tourism are not senior enough. Even the head of tourism isn't necessarily at the right level to be in the strategic seat and that is a key problem within the region" (R1).

The interviewees agree that the electorate's view of tourism contributes to its low status.

"I don't think it is in the minds of a lot of those groups that Leeds would be a tourist destination in any way. So it is probably not on the radar" (L4).

"I mean to most people tourism...the tourism agenda just doesn't exist... People know about and appreciate City centre attractions but haven't connected them with tourism... Despite the fact that it brings in a huge amount of money – it is almost kind of happening on the margins" (L3).

The local electorate appear to be unaware of the role of tourism in the City and focus their concern and pressure on other services such as housing, education and social services. In this context it is unsurprising that tourism has a low political profile and is a low priority for the elected Councillors.

"It is not a key thing in the sense that it never gets talked about ...the politicians are not spending enough time thinking about it...it doesn't have the weight that it should have – it is not far enough up the agenda" (L3).
Lack of Clarity

The interviewees identify a lack of clarity about tourism policy making and service provision in terms of its role and nature, where it fits, and its connections with other areas of policy. R1 links the lack of clarity with the low status of tourism within the Council structure with the tourism manager not having sufficiently high status to be able to influence and enact strategic policy in the City.

“There is a complete lack of understanding from the tourism perspective... lack of a clear idea at strategic level about what tourism policy should achieve... (Policies are) made at quite a junior level... and it tends to be a bottom up approach to effecting policy” (R1).

R1 says tourism “is a fragmented sector which is dominated by SME’s and by micro businesses” and public sector resource should be focussed on coordinating these businesses and enabling them to contribute to the economy. She claims that despite this clear justification for public sector involvement, LAs have interpreted this as “we’ll market you” (R1). She considers that policy makers in Leeds do not have a clear idea about what they hope to achieve from tourism, or what their role should be and claims that it is difficult to identify the objectives of local tourism policy in Leeds.

“their policies are not that clear... In Leeds they don't have a clear plan of where they are going. I think it is largely to do with promotion rather than even the whole marketing mix” (R1).

R1 notes that there is a lack of clarity about the benefits of tourism to the City, which she claims are not direct and therefore intangible to the local population. She says that tourism policy has to involve communicating the benefits of tourism, to key policy makers and to the local community but there appears to be no “internal marketing” activity to communicate the benefits of tourism in Leeds. R1 also highlights a lack of clarity about the role of the public sector in subsidising the private sector.
"There is a conflict of interest. Are they trying to make a profit out of the private sector or are they trying to enable the private sector to get their products to market" (R1).

In addition to the lack of clarity around the LAs role of tourism, and the benefits of that role there is also uncertainty about the place of tourism and its links with other policy areas. L4 and R1 refer to the lack of clarity about the links between the CS and tourism.

"that activity needs to be brought further in. I think it (Tourism Forum) probably has isolated itself initially with the Cultural Strategy being very much driven by the Department of Learning and Leisure – although the Development Department is very well aware of it... but I think there may well be more that we can do to make sure it has its rightful place on the agenda wherever it is sitting and it has its rightful link to the Cultural Strategy" (L4).

"the interface between culture and tourism has not been fully explored. Does one sit under the other? Do they just link in certain areas?" (R1).

*The nature of communication at local level*

The last section identified where tourism sits in the LA, how it relates to other policy agendas and the characteristics of the relationship. This section focuses communication, one key aspect of that relationship that was highlighted by all the interviewees. Good communication is essential to developing coordinated strategy and the LI has introduced networks of partnerships to improve communication between different sectors and different parts of the Council.

"(Good communication) is integral to doing the job, working across very diverse and different cultures, making sure that you try to find ways of encouraging each to understand the other and to look at different perspectives...There has been a huge effort over the past two years to bring people together to use the networks that we have got, to widen the networks, to present an objective analysis of where the City is at the moment" (L4).
The communication links between the Vision, the CS and the TSL are developed through Strategy Groups or partnerships. L4 identifies a network of strategy groups and says that tourism also links to the City Centre Management Group and the City Centre Management Initiative Forum. These networks are perceived to be complex by a number of other policy makers including L2 and L3.

"We've got the Cultural Partnership which is a strategic group, a very influential group of people meeting together to oversee the Cultural Strategy ...and within that there are a number of sub strands. And there is a Tourism Forum which tries to draw together different interests in tourism and that is sort of networked into the Cultural Partnership and the Leeds Initiative more generally" (L4).

The characteristics of communication

Communication between the tourism manager and other policy makers/influencers at the local level has three main characteristics, the first relates to the low status of tourism in the policy hierarchy, the second and third stem from the lack of clarity and uncertainty about the role of the LA in tourism policy making and benefits of tourism to the City.

Low Status

The Tourism Forum was set up as a mechanism to enable discussion about tourism policy and planning with industry interests and within the Council and to feed back into the wider policy networks. The Forum appears to have a low status within the organisation. L3 says that it has only met a few times and attendance has been very low with only 3 or 4 people turning up to meetings. "I don't think it is a lack of will, I think its just everybody is just so busy" (L3).

There are a range of issues here linked to the perceived status of the group which has not practically had any direct links into the Cultural Partnership (CP). Key people in the industry are more likely to be involved if they think it will benefit them or have an impact on wider policies but interest is likely to be more limited if it is just a discussion group, with no funds or power.
Lack of clarity and lack of understanding

Interviewees were able to highlight a number of examples of poor communication that stem from uncertainty and a lack of clarity about how tourism fits with other policy areas. These examples also reflect the low status tourism has in the Council. L3 refers to a CP meeting where a connection is made between the arts, culture and tourism. As a result the tourism manager was invited onto the CP.

"The Partnership has not been going for long but nevertheless that had not been thought of before. I thought that was just kind of symptomatic really of how much joined up thinking that still needs to be done"(L3).

The policy hierarchy outlined in Figure 6 of the case study shows that the TSL is clearly linked to CS as a “daughter” strategy (L6). In the circumstances it is surprising that the tourism manager was not brought into the discussion about the development and implementation of the CS. Until she was included in this forum, there was no tourism voice or input into the CS.

There is lack of communication between the tourism manager and other policy makers in the development department.

"Since I've taken up this position I have had little if any contact with (the tourism manager)...there has been no recent working with key players (tourism)" (L5).

This lack of communication has led to a lack of understanding of tourism in Leeds. The officer charged with developing and monitoring tourism policy for the UDP did not have up to date knowledge about the attractions and the wider tourism policies in the City. For example he identifies Tetley’s Brewery Wharf as a major tourism attraction but this attraction closed six years prior to the interview.

R1 provides evidence of poor communication and lack of coordination between tourism and transport within the LCC.
“(Tetley’s Brewery Wharf) closed a while ago (1998). And all the brown signs are up so who coordinates that” (R1).

There has been a lack of clarity in terms of the marketing strategy adopted by the Council with a duplication of marketing efforts by the City centre team, the tourism team, inward investment and the LI. This has led to the development of a marketing approach that is confused and lacks focus.

“So little pockets of work being done to market and promote Leeds but they tend to give different messages. So no coordination in terms of what the key messages are that we are seeking to portray or what the marketing approach ought to be” (L1).

**Perpetual change in the LA**

The tourism policy environment is characterised by perpetual change and this section considers the views of interviewees about change in the Leeds, change in local tourism policy and the wider policy framework and change in the structures and organisations delivering tourism policy. At the local level the City has changed dramatically in terms of its economy and built infrastructure and continues to change.

“If you go back 15 years an extremely parochial City with a lot of indigenous businesses and what we have found in the last few years, a lot of big firms have either moved to Leeds or they have consolidated their headquarters” (L1).

The LCC and its policies are constantly changing. L3 starts the interview by pointing to organisational changes in 2003 and emphasises the idea that the organisation is changing and evolving. As the organisation changes and tourism moves from one place to another the emphasis and nature of tourism policy changes.

“... tourism moved from Learning and Leisure to Development”... “making more of those connections with the functions of the Development Department” (L2).
"Tourism policy will develop and change in the next few years purely because the way the world is changing and the way that cities are viewed" (L1).

LCC priorities develop and change in response to specific problems and in the wider local policy environment there are a number of new initiatives that are likely to have an impact on tourism. An example of this is ML which has been developed in response to the Brahm research into public perceptions and is discussed by all interviewees except L5. L1 highlights the importance of developing a single coordinated approach to marketing to replace the variety of small and fragmented marketing initiatives that have been developed by different parts of the Council. L1 and L2 explain that ML is a private/public sector partnership company with two shareholders LCC and the Chamber of Commerce.

The increasing importance of ML is likely to impact on tourism policy but those impacts are not discussed by interviewees and are unclear. ML is likely to shape wider policy and the context within which tourism policy is made and the service is delivered in the future. L4 indicates that a major challenge in developing ML will be finding resources to promote Leeds. The challenge to resource this project raises questions about how tourism marketing will be funded and whether it will be explicitly included within the new initiative.

**The characteristics of change**

The interviewees identify a number of characteristics of change, including the idea that change is a major contributor to the uncertainty and lack of clarity about tourism policy, and paradoxically that dynamic changes in the wider policy environment are unlikely to affect the status of tourism.

*Lack of clarity and uncertainty*

The first of these ideas is that constant change contributes to a lack of clarity and uncertainty. A number of interviewees indicate that organisational change has not improved clarity about the role of the tourism service and its relationship with other
service areas. They highlight the uncertainty about the links between tourism and "mainstream policy" areas and about the delivery of tourism services in the future. L4 and L2 consider that the current changes are likely to bring tourism further into the mainstream of local policy activity. L3, L4 and L6 highlight the uncertainty about the delivery of the tourism service and the continued lack of clarity about whether tourism is best dealt with directly by the LA saying "there is still a lot of work to be done to see how that should work out" (L4).

"It looks to me there is a huge amount of work still to be done on how all these different ingredients should come together...whether it (tourism service) is best dealt with within the authority - or at arms length" (L3).

Interviewees including L1 and L3 indicate that the nature and pace of change is intensifying and this increases uncertainty about the place, nature and role of the tourism service i.e. several interviewees are not clear about the name of the new department within which tourism is located. The uncertainty about the nature and role of the LA in tourism is exacerbated by uncertainty about the scope and remit of emerging initiatives such as ML, which appear to have a tourism dimension.

**Continuing low status of tourism**

The second characteristic identified by 4 interviewees is that changes to the organisation and policy have not affected the status of tourism at the local level. L1, L4, L6 and R1 think that current organisational and policy changes are unlikely to increase the status of tourism policy.

**The characteristics of change in the Region**

At the regional level all interviewees comment about relationships and communication in the context of current proposals for change. In the past regional tourism policy has been developed and delivered by YTB. This changed in 2003 when the strategic responsibility for tourism was devolved to the RDA's. Tourism policy is now developed by YF who guide and fund the activities of the YTB. L1, L2, L3, L4, L6 and R1 outline YF's proposals for tourism services to be delivered by Destination Management
Organisations (DMOs) on a sub regional level. L1, L3 and L6 discuss the proposed changes to the role and remit of the YTB. From a regional perspective regional structures are being reorganised in order;

"to strengthen tourism delivery at a local level...(to) allow local authorities to do what they should do best (and)....allow the industry and tourism professionals to deliver the rest" (R1).

*Lack of clarity and lack of congruence*

From a local perspective the changes proposed at the regional level are characterised by a lack of clarity.

"Yorkshire Forward, being new, decided to get consultants to undertake a review of the Yorkshire Tourist Board and its role and they have made a number of proposals"... "So West Yorkshire, as a sub region - would have what they call a Destination Management Organisation (DMO) which we struggled with ... in terms of what responsibilities would that body have and I must admit it was a lack of detail it was hard to get beneath it" (L1).

"There are some issues to do with the regional developments. How we are going to manage destination management etc. Whether it is through local authorities or whether there will be regional arrangements made. There are issues about the way that policy is made and at what level and how consistent it is" (L4).

There appears to be a lack of congruence between wider initiatives at a national level and the proposed sub-regional structure.

"There is much more recognition now about the importance of Leeds to the whole of the Yorkshire economy... (The) debate about Core Cities and City Regions and importance of the Core City on that and the economy is something that is relatively new...(In this context Leeds has) problems just related to the "West Yorkshire" sub region as an entity because we actually relate better to the rest of the region. So sometimes that feels like a straightjacket" (L4).
The characteristics of the local/regional relationship

Lack of consensus and lack of clarity

From a local perspective this relationship is characterised by a lack of consensus and a lack of clarity about how regional policy will be implemented within the Region. L1, L2, L3 and L4 provide evidence of lack of consensus between regional and local policy makers about delivery structures for tourism. They question the validity of the sub regional structure for tourism, express the view that Leeds has a wider role outside of the sub regional level and express concern about the proposed changes to the YTB.

“All the various people from the tourist organisations within Yorkshire have objected to that because they couldn’t see how DMO’s were going to work. So Yorkshire Forward’s proposals have kind of been rejected...Yorkshire Forward has come up with all these proposals as if Yorkshire Tourism Board did not know what it was doing, whereas in fact it is doing very well in terms of attracting people to Yorkshire...Improvements yes – but not so root and branch – ignoring what’s good, as Yorkshire Forward was suggesting” (L3).

There is also a lack of clarity about how tourism initiatives fit with other regionally funded initiatives. For example Leeds has put in a bid for YF funding for City wide marketing through ML of “£900,000 over the next 5 years” (L1), but it is not clear at the local or regional level how this initiative impacts on tourism marketing and the tourism service.

From a regional perspective the relationship is characterised by LAs lacking understanding about tourism, which has led to a lack of clarity about their role and objectives in respect of tourism.

“We expected a much higher level understanding of tourism within different local authorities and it is not there...(Regional policy is) quite difficult to achieve because local authorities have not got their act together...They want us to tell them what the implications are, what the issues are for them. The thought at
senior level, the clarity of thought just isn't there. They need to work out what the implications are for them" (R1).

**The characteristics of local/regional communication**

*Low status in LA's and authoritarian approach from the Region*

Both the local and regional interviewees identify poor communication between the LAs and the Region. R1 connects poor communication between the LAs and the Region with the low status of tourism. She notes that powerful people have not become engaged in tourism strategy. Those who are involved have a relatively low status and have direct interest in protecting the status quo.

"The consultation that we have just done on regional tourism structures although all the invitations went to chief executives in the local authorities it was actually tourism officers and tourism information centre managers that turned up to discuss regional tourism strategic issues. So it was a bit like asking turkeys to vote for Christmas when we started talking about local authorities giving up responsibility in some areas" (R1).

Communication between the Region and LCC is perceived as being difficult and one-sided and L1, L2, L3, L4 and L6 express frustration at the lack of negotiation and discussion around tourism proposals.

"They are not very open...it's always being done to you...I don't really think, to be honest, that they have stimulated a huge amount of collaborative work within Leeds. We've got the feeling that they've sort of imposed this West Yorkshire Structure on us" (L4).

**Summary**

The 2004 narrative considered tourism policy making using 3 themes, relationships, communication and perpetual change; and identifies key characteristics under each of those themes. Three dominant characteristics (lack of status, uncertainty and lack of clarity) run through the narratives and appear to have major implications for the
approach to developing and enacting tourism policy at the local level. These implications are considered in more depth after discussion of the interviews in 2005.

Narrative 2: 2005

In the period between the first and the second interviews there were several major changes which have implications on tourism policy making including a change in the political leadership of the Council, changes to tourism staffing and management. These changes are discussed prior to the consideration of the relationship between tourism policy and broader local policy, communication at the local level and the wider policy environment (national and regional).

Changes in the local policy environment

Tourism policy making in Leeds is characterised by a rapidly changing environment at the local, regional and national level. Change is a ‘constant’ theme over the study period and is considered at the local level in terms of the changes to the leadership, organisation and policies. L9 refers to the "state of change" and "flux" that will exist for the next few years until the new leadership make decisions.

Change in political leadership

Interviewees including L1, L4, L7, L8 and L9 discuss the relatively smooth and easy transition from a Labour leadership to a new leadership by the Alliance (Conservative, Liberal Democrats and Greens) and which they attribute to a “maturity” of the incoming administration and to the approach adopted to policy making in Leeds.

“The people in the top political jobs have waited an enormously long time for the leadership role in Leeds and I think they want to see that succeed” (L4).

“We put a lot thinking in to the way that we took all the different political groups through the process of agreeing it (the Vision), because we knew it was likely that there would be a change in administration” (L4).
"The Labour administration was slowly losing its power base...So we took a conscious decision 3 years or so ago to make sure all of the politicians, particularly the leading politicians in the then opposition groups were involved and influencing key decisions or key policies" (L1).

L1, L4, and L7 indicate that there were similarities in the manifestos of the three opposition parties at the last election that arose largely because all parties were signed up to the Vision. In setting up a coalition the Conservatives, Liberal Democrats and the Greens;

"looked at each other’s manifestos and agreed on an administration and set of priorities that reflected the common parts of our manifestos, which were amazingly many actually" (L7).

One major change at the broader level is the decision by the Alliance to introduce 2 ½ % budget cuts across its services for the next three years. The budget cuts have impacted on the tourism service and these impacts will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter. The majority of interviewees think that similar budget cuts would have been made if Labour had retained power.

"If Labour had got in I don’t think it would have made any difference...Certainly in terms of this service I don’t think it would have made any difference...I think that we would have got squeezed who ever was in power...I don’t think that tourism has been particularly labelled out for those cuts...it is just that everything is cut down to the minimum particularly in the non statutory areas" (L9).

Organisational and policy changes

The reorganisation in 2003 moved tourism away from Learning and Leisure to Development and over the past two years additional changes have been made to bring it closer into the Inward Investment section of the Development Department. L1, L8, and
L9 say that the reorganisation is likely to develop the economic aspects of tourism policy but has had no significant impact on tourism policy to date.

In late 2004 the tourism manager resigned and the decision was taken to freeze the post for a year and to redistribute this function around the Inward Investment Team. The decision not to fill the post was made in the context of wider cuts to budgets across LCC and on the basis of uncertainty about the nature and structure of tourism services in the future. The decision is remarkably uncontroversial at the local level with agreement from L1, L4, and L8 and L9 that it is not appropriate to fill that post at present. L1, L4 and L7 articulate confidence that the service will be delivered effectively through the new structure whereas L8 and L9 say that the reduction in resources for the tourism service means that not all areas of the service will be delivered. Resources have been allocated to front line services such as the conference office and the TIC rather than engaging in research or policy development.

ML is the main local policy initiative that has implications on tourism policy in Leeds is (L1, L4, L8, L9 and R1) and these will be discussed below.

**Characteristics of local change**

**Lack of clarity uncertainty and low status**

There is a lack of clarity about ML in terms of its impact on tourism policy and service delivery in Leeds.

"it may well be, in a year's time, 18 month's time, the Council decides it wants to put its tourism function into Marketing Leeds...We've got to wait for a decision to go down that route" (L9).

"they have the added complication of Marketing Leeds...I get the impression that they are not 100% about what that means in terms of their tourism role" (R3).
There is also a lack of clarity about the motives behind the decision to freeze the tourism manager post, which is perceived as an opportunity to improve the relationship between tourism policy and other policies by some, and an opportunistic response to budget cuts, change and uncertainty by others. L8 and L9 see it as a way to develop synergies between tourism and the Inward Investment Team and improve the relationship with economic policy. L4 sees it as an opportunity to consider how to integrate tourism into ML. Alternatively;

"One of the reasons why we haven’t replaced her at the moment is because we thought it was premature given all these other changes going on" (L8).

"We are trying to look for efficiency savings and economies of scale where we can work together" (L9).

The implications of this decision is that “they are one body down” (R2) and there are less resources for the tourism function.

"Certain things aren’t going to happen because clearly we have got less resources...what we are trying to do, is to determine what our priorities are and to focus on those" (L9).

The changes outlined above have led to greater uncertainty about the nature and place of tourism policy in Leeds. LCC’s response to tourism in the context of change has been opportunistic and this can be attributed to the low status and non statutory nature of tourism. While the budget cuts were not specifically focussed on tourism, they appear to have disproportionately impacted on the tourism service as a result of the decision to freeze the manager’s post. L1, L8 and L9 consider it is unlikely that the tourism manager would have been made redundant but her decision to leave offered an opportunity to save money and reconsider how and where tourism policy should be made in the context of wider changes. These circumstances have increased uncertainty about the future of the tourism service and the lack of clarity about where tourism will fit into emerging initiatives. The uncertainty is expressed by all interviewees;
"but just what exactly the future will be in terms of how we see it (tourism) in the context of Marketing Leeds is a little unclear... There are possible connections to be made but we don’t know how to do it yet" (L4).

The problems faced by the tourism service

In the context of these changes interviewees were asked to identify issues or problems facing the tourism service and broader issues that would impact on tourism. L9 identifies inadequacies in the information provided for visitors referring to the Council website and the capabilities of the information system. Leeds does not have a dedicated website for visitors and lacks a destination management system, which means it is unable to take on-line bookings. These issues were previously raised by R1 in 2004, but were not discussed by the local interviewees. L9 indicates that the inadequacies in the tourism infrastructure (the lack of a major conference venue or arena and a dedicated coach park facility) have not been resolved.

L9 identifies a number of emerging issues including the reluctance “to spend real money on marketing”, which has led to very few brochures being printed to advertise local attractions and the TIC predominantly providing information about what is available outside of Leeds. He also identified staffing problems including low morale arising from restructuring and the decision not to appoint a new tourism manager.

Relationship between tourism policy and wider policy

The interviewees perceive tourism policy as a small part of wider policy, and their comments are very similar those made by interviewees in 2004. The interviewees identify that tourism policies often cannot be separated out from other policies.

“if you look at the list of priorities in terms of initiatives or projects for example the “Vision for Leeds”, the Local Plan, now many of those are important for tourism but not exclusively. So you have got the new concert hall, new theatre, new museum are all pretty critical for the tourism offering. But they are not just for the tourism offering they are critical for the Leeds offer generally” (L8).
The interviewees make clearer links between tourism policy and economic policy than in 2004 and this reflects the Council’s reorganisation to move tourism from Learning and Leisure into Development Services. L4, L8 and L9 perceive tourism as “a key sector of the economy” (L8) that is tied into the development of the City centre economy but is also tied into the CS. L8 and L9 perceive that tourism is the policy area where the cultural agenda and the economic development agenda meet. The CS identifies clear links between tourism and culture (Figure 6 in Chapter 6) but in practice it appears that the diagram may overstate the relationship. L1, L4, L8 and L9 consider these links not explicit or directly supported by any mechanism to communicate or deliver policy across the two areas. The lack of clarity around this relationship and poor communication will be discussed later in this Chapter.

There is a lack of clarity about the relationship between ML (the organisation with a remit to deliver a coordinated marketing strategy for the City) and tourism. ML has no explicit tourism role or remit but R2 claims that they have targeted tourism businesses in developing a funding/membership base. It appears that the activities of ML will impact upon tourism to the City. L1, L8, L9 and R2 agree that the tourism function is likely to be taken over by ML in the future.

“In many ways the most likely thing is for Marketing Leeds to be expanded to incorporate tourism” (L8).

“I think eventually what will happen is that (tourism) will probably come under Marketing Leeds. It depends whether or not they stick to their remit or whether they want to broaden it out” (R2).

**Characteristics of the relationship between tourism and other service areas**

**Increasing status or continued low status?**

L4 argues that tourism policy had the potential to become more important by being linked into the discussion about ML. Both R3 and L4 argue that tourism is increasingly discussed by decision makers who have high status, such as chief executive officers, heads of departments, business leaders and key politicians. R3 attributes this to the
development of regional strategy and L4 to developments associated with ML. L7 argues that the new leadership are taking a much sharper interest in expanding tourism in the City and sees the attraction of more visitors to Leeds as critical in achieving the objective in the Vision to “Go up a league”.

The assertion that tourism is going up the agenda is contested by a number of respondents including L1, L8, L9 and R3 who argue that tourism policy making in Leeds continues to have a low status. They suggest a number of reasons for this including the low political priority of tourism, its low status in a diverse local economy and its non-statutory nature. R3 refers to the position of tourism policy making at LCC as “marginal” and L1 says “from a local authorities service provision perspective it is on the periphery” (L1).

“Tourism isn’t the number one priority for Leeds City Council and therefore it is not a political “hot potato” ...When you come down to policy issues I don’t think it features greatly. (Tourism)...is not a key sector of the economy. It is important, but given the breadth of the Leeds economy...In terms of the local authority’s expenditure and profile it is not seen as that significant ”(L8).

Its low status is partly attributed to a tension between the nature of tourism and the nature of local democracy which is summarised thus “tourism is very much focussed on getting people in from outside and the Council is very much focussed on the residents” (L8).

L1, L8 and L9 highlight the wider context of budget cuts which means funding is being directed at statutory services which are resident based such as education, social services and housing. In this context “where on earth are you going to get the money that you should really be putting into tourism?” (L8)

“If there is ever an environment where you need to find cuts, in any local authority, those cuts are normally heaviest in the non statutory services because clearly you have got to keep providing the schools, you have got to keep providing social services, you have got to keep on providing public housing etc.
So that small element of discretionary spending is the area that traditionally tends to get squeezed" (L9).

Some interviewees do not think that tourism policy had sufficient status to be represented or developed by wider policy initiatives. Tourism is not "particularly on the agenda in wider policy making" (L8). L8 and L9 perceive that tourism interests have been marginal and marginalized in the process of developing ML.

"people here feel that they have been marginalized in that, their expertise has been marginalized and brushed over" (L9).

Lack of clarity

L7, L8 and R3 express the view that tourism policy "doesn't fit" (L8) with wider Council structures or feed clearly into the policy process.

"Tourism just exists in a bit of a box...and not enough is drawn on other expertise" (R3).

Interviewees including L1, L4, L8, L9 and R3 perceive economic and cultural policy "meet around the tourism area" (L9) but they consider the relationship and fit is not explicit or clear.

"there is something around tourism and culture ...and how they are taken forward separately ...because a lot of what Leeds is talking about in terms of itself as a destination is about culture...this needs to be tangled up a bit more, particularly in the case of Leeds because it is very much using that cultural attractions base for tourism purposes" (R3).

"we have not thought about how we articulate the importance of tourism (in economic policy). It is not one of our key sectors ...I am not even sure whether it should be...Formally the tourism agenda comes under the Cultural Partnership because of the DCMS... Now that doesn't fit very well with development actually
and we haven't quite sussed the links between tourism and the Cultural Partnership since tourism moved from Learning and Leisure" (L8).

The lack of clarity about the way that tourism policy fits with other policy areas relates to the lack of status of the tourism service. Tourism issues are not perceived to be important enough for decision makers to prioritise or devote time to resolving them. There is significant evidence to support this idea from L1, L4, L8, L9, R2 and R3.

"We have never sorted out the Tourism Forum being a proper sub group of the Cultural Partnership...I just haven't seen it as a high enough priority in terms of the other things that need to be done. Ideally yes, we do that, we have not done it because we haven't got the time" (L8).

There is a lack of clarity about the emerging role of ML in respect of tourism and interviewees express different views about the nature of this relationship. L7 perceives tourism as a core part of or "the whole thrust of" ML whereas other interviewees including R2, L8, L9 and L4 perceive a much broader remit with tourism on its periphery.

Nature and characteristics of communication

Figure 6 in Chapter 6 clearly outlined a policy hierarchy with the Vision at the top then the CS as a "daughter" and the TSL as a "grand-daughter". This hierarchy implies that there are lines of reporting or communication between the levels. The interviewees in 2004 indicated that communication would occur through the Tourism Forum and participation by the tourism manager in the Cultural Partnership (CP). The Tourism Forum was identified as the main mechanism for communicating and linking tourism policy into wider initiatives such as the CS and the Vision.

Low status and lack of clarity

In May 2005 there was confusion about the role and existence of the Tourism Forum. L8 and L9 say that the Forum meets but they do not communicate their activities to the CP and do not engage in policy activities. The Forum has such a low profile that key
policy makers, L1, L2, L4, R2 and R3, are not sure whether it still exists and have not attended meetings.

"It has gone quite quiet in all honesty and where that Forum reports to and what it is up to I don't know... I have no reason to believe that the Tourism Forum does not exist at the moment but I honestly don't know... I can't pretend that in any meaningful way the Tourism Forum has to my recollection even produced one single report to the Cultural Partnership" (L4).

"I personally don't engage with the Tourism Forum. I went to one meeting two years ago and I must admit I have not necessarily seen or heard anything about it since so it can't be that active... from my perspective it's not been very active recently" (L1).

Two local interviewees are involved in the Forum and indicate that it has an information sharing role rather than a policy role and operates;

"on a fairly low key basis... because we haven't had the resources to put into developing that forum... it hasn't been the highest priority on our list of things to do" (L8).

The Development Department perceive that they are unable to be proactive in developing the Forum until they are clearer about the remit and purpose of ML and whether it will take over the tourism service. Whilst officers recognise there is a need to improve links between the Forum and other parts of the Council, and local businesses they do not have the resources to develop these links. One of the implications of the low status and profile of the Tourism Forum is that its activities and ideas are not communicated to key decision makers in other areas which exacerbates the lack of clarity about tourism policy in Leeds.

At local level there is poor communication about tourism policy and tourism issues are not clearly communicated to key decision makers. From a regional perspective this poor communication is common in LA’s in the region. R2 and R3 identify a lack of vertical
communication in LAs and a lack of horizontal communication between the different departments.

"The number of times that I have had meetings with economic development and tourism to find out that is the first time that they have met each other" (R2).

**Lack of consensus and poor communication**

It is clear that there is tension between people involved in developing ML and the Development Department about the place and nature of tourism services in the future.

"Our perspective is one of frustration to be honest with you ...the way they have gone about it has not really been in the spirit of partnership...it is the usual problem in large organisations...you get people with their little empires who don't talk to one another...they subscribe to the word partnership but don't necessarily work in those terms and don't necessarily recognise the expertise that they could utilise...The only way that Marketing Leeds can deliver, is raising our game around tourism and pulling in more visitors and around the investment market as well. And the only way it can do that ...is actually resolving some of the partnership problems that we have" (L9).

"Decisions about who is responsible for it (tourism), appear to be made elsewhere without consultation...In process terms there are some lessons to be learned about how you bring people with you in a major project like the City Image Project" (L4).

R2 claims the tourism manager's decision to resign is directly linked to lack of consensus about the role of tourism, the uncertainty about its place in the organisation and its relationship with ML.

**Changes in the wider policy environment**

The uncertainty and change in the local tourism policy environment is also evident in the wider policy environment i.e. at national and regional level. The interviewees outline the
major initiatives that impact on tourism planning and policy making in Leeds focussing on the City Region, the Northern Way and the proposed administrative and policy changes at regional level which have arisen as a result of the decision by the DCMS to devolve tourism to the regions.

**Increasing importance of the City Region**

The City Region Initiative is likely to impact on the relationship between Leeds and the surrounding areas, increase collaboration across local boundaries and has the potential to affect the nature of tourism policy. This initiative is discussed by all the local interviewees and defined as “a hinterland (which is) built on the brand of Leeds” (L9). stemming from

“...the idea of an economic core benefiting a wider hinterland. Very much with the patterns of travel between places based on an economic whole” (L4).

The City Region implies closer working across LA boundaries and improving relationships between people in the local region “so that we can better understand the links between the different areas and people” (L4).

“...trying to identify what the strategic issues are for this area to be competitive with other areas in the UK and Europe...What we are trying to do is identify what the common issues are and then use that strategic collaboration at that level to influence government, Yorkshire Forward and other regional bodies about what their priorities are and what their spend is” (L1).

The interviewees were very positive about the impacts and implications of the City Region initiative. However a number of interviewees including L9 and R3 identified that local politics and rivalry would make collaboration more difficult. "It needs handling carefully because of the political sensibilities” (L7).

“There is not the same acceptance here in West Yorkshire that there is a Leeds conurbation and that is down to history. It’s the Leeds/Bradford thing that we had..."
two competing cities which grew up quite independently and quite separately" (L9).

There are mixed views on whether the City Region will have any implications on tourism policy with some interviewees perceiving that it offers opportunities and others claiming there is not a direct link.

"I think that there are opportunities for things like promoting the City Region for tourism...it has such a huge amount to offer for short breaks and such, that if we were to work together and take advantage of all those places and promote them better as one offer then I think that would be a good thing" (L4).

"the City Region is more about policy, particularly about policy from a planning perspective, transport needs, land-use needs etc. There isn't a direct correlation" (L1).

**Increasing importance of the Northern Way**

The Northern Way aims to improve collaboration, relationships and develop regional policy making across the 3 RDA's in the North of England. L1, L7, L8 and L9 say the Northern Way builds on the City Region and the idea that "there are mutual connected advantages in working together" (L9). The interviewees make clear links between the Northern Way and tourism policy.

"In terms of the tourism agenda, there is recognition that it makes sense for the North of England to work together, certainly in international markets...It makes no sense for us to try to promote little brands in the international market when we have effective strength in the North of England" (L9).

"the proposal is to have quite a large overseas marketing campaign, which will include the whole of the North of England" (R3).
Changes in the Region

The decision to devolve strategic responsibility for tourism down to the RDA's led to proposals to develop sub regional structures to deliver tourism services and change the remit of the YTB. The interviews conducted in 2004 indicate that the relationship between the region and the LAs is characterised by poor communication, a lack of consensus and a lack of understanding. The interviewees in 2005 report on the review of the sub regional proposals, implementation of the changes to the YTB and personnel changes since 2004. These changes will be discussed in turn and the main characteristics will be identified.

One of the implications of the devolution of tourism to the regions was YF's decision to restructure tourism services across the region. R2 identifies that a specific manager made it very clear that she wanted change and wanted 4 DMO's in the sub regions. This change makes sense from YF's perspective as it aligns very closely with their administrative and funding structures. However from the local perspective the sub-regional structures are not perceived to be relevant and do not fit well with national initiatives, such as the City Region and Northern Way.

"The City Region recognises the economic facts of life, with respect, Yorkshire Forwards designation doesn't. The City Region is the way to go because it recognises the clear linkages that there are between Leeds, its travel to work area, it is the area which it effects economically which stretches to York and it stretches to Skipton in North Yorkshire and it goes down to Barnsley" (L7).

YF has reviewed the structure and role of the YTB and is in the process of implementing changes. The YTB

"remains the regional tourism organisation with a distinct remit of attracting visitors to the region...Yorkshire Forward funding is specifically for bringing visitors to the region and delivering a certain amount of regional tourism activities like research, a research intelligence function" (R3).
Interviewees including L9, R2 and R3 highlight the changes to the Board which means LAs have lost their seat and a direct say in the management decisions of YTB. This overcomes the problems that previously arose from the YTB being;

"controlled by the local authorities and each local authority had an equal voice. It meant you ended up with political fudge (and) it was not as effective as it could be" (L9).

YF have produced a consultation document called a Strategic Framework for Tourism and the Visitor Economy to outline strategy for the next 5 years, with a headline target of growth of the tourism economy at 5% per annum until 2010 (R3). Below this broad strategy the YTB are tasked with producing a regional tourism marketing strategy to provide a broad framework for marketing Yorkshire. Their intention is to identify target segments of the market and then to work with and fund those authorities who can ‘deliver’ in these specific segments. R2 says that emerging policy from the YTB will change the role of the LA’s from marketing to product development and visitor management. He also indicates that the sub-regional partnerships will produce area tourism plans to outline how they will implement the regional strategy.

Two key players involved in the development and delivery of regional tourism policy left YF at the end of 2004. One was the person who instigated the sub-regional proposals and the other was the tourism manager who had a direct responsibility in managing and delivering policy. Whilst the tourism manager’s post has not been officially frozen, the decision has been made not to advertise until the new financial year and a series of consultants have been employed to provide temporary cover. This decision has implications for the development and delivery of tourism policy at the regional level which in 2005 was contracted out and provided on a part time basis. The current consultant works four days a week and her role “is very much about just getting things done to keep things moving. What it is not really about, is developing relationships etc” (R3). The approach to policy is reactive and the consultant has not developed the networks and relationships that enable good communication and effective working with LAs.
The characteristics of change in the Region

The changes outlined above have clearly impacted upon the relationship and the nature of communication between the Region and Leeds. All interviewees identify difficulties in the relationship and a breakdown in communication in 2004. R2 highlights the importance of an incident at the Region's tourism conference in April 2004.

"The Vice Chairman of Yorkshire Forward was briefed by XXX, to give a presentation which started with "I am glad to see consensus about the structures" and (he) just got bombarded... he just walked into it ...not well briefed... He went back to his board and said he wanted an internal review about how did we get into this situation, and it became clear that there was misalignment of the views that were put forward" (R2).

This appears to have been the catalyst for major changes in the local/regional relationship with the region devolving the responsibility for creating the sub regional structures to the LAs.

Lack of consensus and resistance

The local interviewees L1, L2, L4, L7, L8 and L9 are hostile to the proposal to deliver tourism via sub regional structures. They say

"...the sub regional thing is nonsense...we do not believe there is any benefit in having a sub regional destination management organisation because we don't think West Yorkshire has a product we don't think West Yorkshire means anything its an administrative boundary and it is no way to organise tourism services" (L9).

"West Yorkshire doesn't match at all with Leeds' influence and its impact... boundaries can be very restrictive really and tourism operates way beyond maps drawn by politicians or bureaucratic organisations" (L7).
The LA's resisted the recommendations by YF for sub regional DMO's and it seems likely that they will resist other proposals made by the region. R2 considers that they will be resistant to emerging marketing strategy which requires them to be less involved in marketing and more involved in product development. The Region will attempt to seek local compliance with regional policy by ensuring that funding will not be available for activities outside of those set out in the marketing strategy.

Resistance to change is also identified at the regional level by R3 who claims that the YTB "haven't embraced that change quite as enthusiastically as they might have done in that they are still continuing to do things that they have always done" (R3).

Lack of clarity and lack of trust

One outcome of this resistance is that there is incremental change rather than "step-change" which has exacerbated the lack of clarity about the objectives of emerging tourism policy and the nature of emerging structures and lack of trust.

"the big step change hasn't really happened... they are keeping what is existing already and all they are really after is the Yorkshire Forward money...from our point of view that if you keep existing partnerships you are not going to get the collective buying. You are not going to get Leeds and Bradford working together collectively driven by customer needs. You are still going to get the political dimension to it and that is where we currently stand" (R2).

The YTB has continued to offer services outside its new remit because "the sub regional arrangements are not there to do them" (R3). The emergent and incremental nature of change has led to uncertainty and a lack of clarity about policy delivery structures at a sub regional level. YF has allowed LAs in the sub-regions to develop structures that meet their needs. This has led to different structures emerging in each sub region.
"It is a completely mixed bag... in West Yorkshire they are developing a tourism partnership themselves which will be alligned to their sub regional economic partnership and will have minimal level of support or resource implications" (R3).

The regional interviewees are concerned that the LAs have paid "lip-service" to developing structures and have been motivated by the desire to access funds rather that any real change to partnership working. This is supported by local interviewees who say "we have to work with the West Yorkshire Structure to access Yorkshire Forward's funds" (L4).

"We recognise that if we want the money from Yorkshire Forward we will need to work together, we will work together, but it will be on our terms" (L8).

In the interviews in 2005, responses are framed around the three themes identified in 2004 with an increased emphasis on change. This is in response to some major changes in the local and regional policy environment. The dominant characteristics identified in 2005 include lack of clarity, uncertainty and low status and were also identified in 2004. There is much more discussion around the lack of consensus surrounding the regional proposals and some discussion about the lack of consensus about the place, nature and extent of the tourism as an element of Council policy. In 2004 there appears to be broad agreement at local level about the key issues and the characteristics of those issues and a divergence of views between the local and regional interviewees. In 2005 there is some divergence of views between local policy makers, which is evidenced when they provide very different explanations and understanding of common issues.

**Comparisons between 2004 and 2005: Common characteristics and the implications of change over the two years**

The next section considers common themes and their key characteristics and identifies the implications of these for tourism policy making. The narratives developed in 2004 and 2005 are structured around three themes: relationships, communication and perpetual change. A number of characteristics are identified within each of these
themes and six common characteristics emerge that occur across the data and link the themes. The most common characteristics are low status, lack of clarity, uncertainty, lack of consensus and lack of congruence and these recur through the interviews with key policy makers in 2004 and 2005. Another recurrent characteristic is complexity, which although not directly discussed by most interviewees is a fundamental factor that underlies many of the comments made during the interviews and helps to explain the other main characteristics. The next section draws out some of the common characteristics of tourism policy making and identifies their implications for tourism policy making.

Low status

A commonly recurring characteristic over the two narratives is the low status of tourism policy making and service provision. Tourism is non-statutory and is perceived to be peripheral to mainstream policy making. It is not "in peoples minds" (L4), does not fit well with LCC's priorities which are "very much focussed on residents" (L8) and "is not seen as significant" (L8), therefore not high on the political agenda. As a discretionary area of LA activity it is particularly at risk in an environment of budget cuts because "those cuts are normally heaviest in the non-statutory services" (L9).

The implications of this are that the tourism service operates with a minimal budget and a small, low status team. Whilst there is evidence of some local tourism research in the past, the team do not currently have the capacity or resources to undertake adequate local research to underpin their tourism policy, and to contribute to and influence wider local policy and regional tourism policy. This chronic under-resourcing at the local level has affected the LA's approach to developing and delivering tourism policy. R1 claims that in Leeds they do not have adequate local data "because it is expensive to collect." She then indicates that the lack of local tourism research is not exclusively a Leeds phenomenon and is common in many LAs. She says;

"(Local tourism policy makers) go and pick pieces of other peoples policies that sound appropriate...it is only when you get a critical eye on it...that looks for an evidence base for all of it and that is where it all falls apart...Actually they don't
go back and say, what is it that we need to do? What is it that we are trying to achieve and go right back to basics and then to work out the detail" (R1).

L9 claims that there has been relative inactivity around the tourism agenda and tourism issues because of on going 'resource constraints'. The tourism service has identified what they want to achieve but "some of these things have been on hold for a number of years" (L9).

"So it's just basically just keeping things going, rather than developing the service and thinking about what we are trying to achieve over the next 5 years" (L8).

The low status of tourism policy has implications on the way that tourism policy is linked to wider policy and communicated to key policy makers. In 2004, interviewees indicated that a Tourism Forum was developed to link tourism policy into the CS and the Vision. The Forum was intended to facilitate communication and inform key partners about the delivery of the TSL but the interviews with L1, L4, L7, L8 and L9 in 2005 indicated that this had not happened. The low status of tourism policy appears to have contributed to a lack of discussion about tourism policy initiatives in the context of the CS and the Vision.

Another issue that arises as a result of the low status of the tourism services is that tourism officers do not have the power to influence key decision makers. R1 and R3 say that the failure of the Highways Department to remove the signposting to an attraction which has been closed for seven years despite requests from the tourism manager provides a clear example of the implications of this lack of power.

The interviewees indicate that the low status of tourism has direct implications on the tourism policy process in Leeds, with policies being developed with minimal research. The low status of tourism policy and policy makers has resulted in policy that "lacks strategic awareness" (R1) and does not clearly feed into wider Council strategies. The narratives indicate that tourism officers do not have sufficient status and resources to develop and deliver a tourism plan. They are unable to influence key decision makers and do not have the resources to support local research or a basic communication network to inform other parts of the Council what they are doing. The low status of tourism means that it is not discussed by policy makers and is "not in peoples mind"
(L2). L1, L2, L3 and L4 who were identified as key "influencers" of tourism policy for this study admit that they do not actively engage in debates and discussions about tourism policy.

**Lack of clarity**

From a regional perspective there is a view that many LAs do not know what role they should play in developing and delivering tourism policy and services or how this policy area should fit with its other policy and political priorities. The implication of this is that they have confused and conflicting tourism objectives.

"The key issues are not particular to Leeds. It is a particular tourism issue, in that local authorities particularly don't know how to deal with tourism and it tends to go on political whim rather than on a strategic basis...there is an assumption that tourism is largely about marketing and that it has an implication for planning, sort of, somewhere down the way, it's linked with economic development, somehow and somewhere, and it can play a role in inward investment, to an extent. But nobody is sure quite how and why...For example Leeds are looking now at the whole City image issues and they don't quite know how that links with tourism" (R1).

The regional perspective is supported by L4 who perceives that tourism is not well integrated into other policy. L4 highlights the need to clarify where tourism fits and how it relates to other service and policy areas.

"in Leeds we have not got that combined effort and regional development and the City Image Project and I think that there is an awful lot to think through really in terms of how we position tourism and how we relate that to other events and activities that go on in the City, widening the picture out is important and playing a more substantial role as a Core City" (L4).

The low status of the Tourism Forum was discussed in the previous section. One of the implications of its low status is that there is a lack of clarity about tourism issues and
about the implementation of the TSL. Key policy makers do not perceive that TSL is being developed or implemented.

“Well from my point of view it has gone very quiet on that. I remember a lot of work being done on the Strategy a couple of years ago, may be a bit longer and I think one was produced, but I am not sure. And I am not sure where it is and who is pressing on with it” (L4).

There is a general lack of clarity and awareness about the tourism service. This is evidenced in 2004 and 2005 by the confusion around the organisational changes (several interviewees were not sure which department it had moved to). Also in 2005 when one interviewee (identified as a key policy maker by other policy makers) was unaware that the tourism manager had left six months before and that her post had been frozen.

Finally there is a lack of clarity about LCCs involvement in tourism policy in the future which has arisen as a result of the decision to freeze the tourism manager’s post. The temporary arrangements have spread different tourism services around the Development Department, particularly the Inward Investment Team. The temporary arrangements seem to have led to less clarity about the links between the CS and the TSL. This is evidenced by failure to invite the temporary “tourism” manager (Head of the Inward Investment Team) to be a member of the CP. The implication is that the communication links between tourism and culture have been severed and CS is developed and implemented without a tourism input or perspective.

Uncertainty

As a result of the lack of clarity around the role of the LA in tourism policy making and in the context of rapid change the interviewees express an uncertainty about delivery structures for tourism and its relationship with other policies. It is unclear whether the tourism service will be delivered in-house, by consultants or in partnership with other organisations. It is not clear if ML will expand its remit to cover tourism marketing or if the service will continue to be delivered by the Development Department. R2 claims that uncertainty about the future of the tourism service contributed to the tourism manager’s
decision to resign and L8 and L9 say the decision to freeze her post is a result of uncertainty about the LA's role in tourism. A number of the interviewees are concerned that the low status and low profile of tourism will lead to the decision about the future of the tourism services being made without "a proper analysis of the advantages and disadvantages" (L9).

Some partnership arrangements have been identified to deliver tourism services at the local level but they need to be investigated further. This has not happened because of uncertainties about "the proposals at regional and sub-regional level and partly because of Marketing Leeds" (L8).

One of the outcomes of this uncertainty is inaction in tourism policy making or planning. "You can't drive it forward with a strong purpose and know exactly where you are going to go because we don't know yet" (L9). L4 claims that uncertainty has had a negative affect on any progress towards developing clear lines of communication and a direct relationship between the CS and TSL. The link between tourism and culture has not been developed in the same way as the links between other daughter strategies such as arts and sport. She attributes inaction to the uncertainty about the remit of ML and its relationship to tourism and says that this "has left the arrangement (between the CS and TSL) pending" (L4).

There is also uncertainty about the role and focus of the new YTB, which is intended to be more business focussed and less politically focussed (L9). Several local interviewees raise questions about YTB's accountability and point out that the change from being a board member to a customer raises issues about subscriptions, which will need to be clearly linked to service delivery in the future. L8 and L9 indicate that the assumption that LAs will continue to pay subscriptions is "naive." (L9) with one LA already refusing to pay this year. This raises major uncertainty about the nature and the role of the YTB in the future.

Finally there is continuing uncertainty about regional policy and the sub regional structures. R2 and R3 highlight uncertainties around the delivery of new structures at the agreed timeframe.
“The aspiration is for all of these things to be operational by the first of April 2006…it would be true to say that Yorkshire Forward has some concerns about that actually happening” (R3).

**Lack of consensus**

In 2004 interviewees report about the lack of consensus around the sub regional proposals. This resulted in a breakdown in communication between the levels and (R2) and a very hostile response to a presentation by the Vice Chair of the YF. The circumstances around this communication breakdown led to YF reviewing its approach to developing sub regional tourism organisations. The major change is that LAs have been given more power to develop sub regional structures. Both R2 and R3 say YF “got its fingers burnt” as a consequence of poor communication and as a result YF withdrew from the process of developing sub-regional DMO’s allowing the LAs to take a lead.

“Yorkshire Forward has provided a framework of what must be done…there is a set of defined roles that sub regional support arrangements will do…and it was agreed that sub regional areas would research and decide, what structure they wanted in their sub region to provide public sector tourism support” (R3).

Whilst this approach has lessened the hostility between the region and Leeds, many local interviewees are still unhappy about the idea of a West Yorkshire sub region. This has manifested itself in terms of a lack of trust and relatively infrequent communication between regional and local players. In the past year YF has focussed on developing sub regional structures;

“…as opposed to doing things on the ground and developing relationships…I can understand why Yorkshire Forward withdrew but I think it probably took one too many steps back… the impression I get at the moment that we are a bit too removed…I just don’t think that at the moment within Yorkshire Forward tourism, that the relationships are very close with any local authorities…To the extent that I don’t even think we know the names of everybody, we don’t even know who the contacts are…the relationships with Leeds are a bit tentative at the moment. There are no personal working relationships” (R3).
The poor relationships between the LAs and the Region have resulted in a lack of trust which is evidenced by R2 and R3 expressing some concern that LAs might be paying lip-service to developing regional structures and the local disquiet about the objectives of the Region.

"I believe that Yorkshire Forward have accepted that we are not going to go down the West Yorkshire DMO line. Although I have this suspicious feeling that, that is still really what they would ultimately like to do and I think it might come back again" (L8).

**Lack of congruence**

There is some concern that regional and local initiatives duplicate or cut across one another. Specifically R2 expresses some concern that there may be duplication between role of YTB and ML and L1, L4, L6, L7, L8 and R3 identify regional policies that appear to "cut across" (L4) or work against one another. A number of interviewees highlight the confusion about developing and delivering regional tourism policy evidenced by different boundaries and approaches of initiatives such as the Northern Way, the City Region and the sub regional DMO's. L4 and L9 express concern that these regional initiatives do not fit. This lack of fit appears to support the local contention that "in economic terms the sub region it is irrelevant, it means nothing" (L9).

"In terms of the West Yorkshire sub-region...that geographical place does not mean an awful lot to Leeds" (L4).

The lack of congruence also leads to uncertainty about how local policy initiatives fit within the sub regional organisation. For example it is not clear how the sub regional requirements of YF fit with Leeds' City Image and ML. This lack of clarity is exacerbated by the decision of YF to support initiatives that appear to have conflicting objectives.

"Yorkshire Forward are funding that Marketing Leeds work it is supporting the City Region work and it is also supporting the sub region work" (L8).
At the regional level there is evidence of poor linkage within YF between the people developing CS and those developing the Regional Tourism Strategy.

"There is cultural prospectus being researched at the moment for West Yorkshire and I don't know much about it, other than Yorkshire Culture have commissioned it ... I know absolutely nothing about it (ML)... That doesn't mean to say Yorkshire Forward haven't been involved in Marketing Leeds. I would anticipate that we probably have been to some extent but I am not aware that we are particularly clear about how that is going to work in terms of the tourism agenda" (R3).

Poor communication at regional level has led to a lack of congruence between different regional policy initiatives. R2 notes that ML is "pump primed by £860,000 of YF funding" but its marketing and awareness raising role appears to conflict with the roles set out by YF for tourism. R2 also claims there is a lack of congruence between the proposal for a "hub and spoke" model for TIC's within the region, which will result in resources being focussed on the hubs, and the closure smaller "spoke" TIC's. This does not fit with a recent funding decision by the YF to set up a new "spoke" TIC's in market towns such as Otley, which appears to directly conflict with regional tourism policy.

The lack of congruence is also evident within the LCC around its funding of the TIC. Changes to the approach to marketing the City have meant that there is a very limited budget for promotional brochures advertising Council run attractions. Over the past few years the TIC has devoted less space to local attractions and is focussed on providing information to encourage people to leave Leeds and visit other places. The rationale for the LA developing and supporting this resource appears to be confused.

**Complexity**

There is another characteristic that emerges over the three themes but that has not been drawn out in the earlier sections of the narratives. This characteristic is complexity and is explicitly discussed by three interviewees in 2004 and one interviewee in 2005. The complexity of tourism policy making arises partly from its low status, lack of clarity, uncertainty, lack of consensus and lack of congruence but these characteristics do not fully encompass the attributes that make it complex. Tourism policy is complex because...
it operates across a wide range of traditional service areas and serves people who do not participate in the local democratic process. It is as a policy area with fuzzy boundaries, spanning many other policy areas and requiring multiple connections to be made across organisations and plans.

In 2004 L2 L3 L4 and L6 discuss the complex and varied networks and connections between tourism and other areas. L2 refers to “All the connections that they have got and Cultural Partnership and the Arts Partnership there are just so many networks and connections” (L2). However, while they recognise these potential connections and have developed some formal mechanisms to connect tourism to wider policy making they indicate that they lack the informal ‘know how’ to make these connections happen.

One of the implications of the difficulty in connecting tourism policy into the wider policy networks is that;

“delivery is so fragmented...there are so many different bits of information in different venues and nobody is coordinating and helping...there is a lot of infrastructure stuff missing and a lot of duplication and there is not a lot of focused and targeted thought” (R1).

The complex nature of tourism policy in Leeds is intensified in the current period of change at the local and regional level and this exacerbates the lack of clarity and uncertainty about the tourism service. L4 says that further work is required to bring the Tourism Forum "a bit more into the fold of the LI groups than it currently is" and to ensure that tourism is brought into wider initiatives but that this will not happen until the role and remit of ML is clearer. There are so many new initiatives affecting tourism in Leeds that it is difficult to understand their implications and difficult to maintain the stability required to implement policies.

In the 2005 narrative L1, L4, L8, L9, R2 and R3 identify the wide range of policies, delivery structures, relationships and communication around tourism policy making. R3 highlights the difficulties in identifying where tourism policy sits and who to talk to in LAs. The variety of arrangements for the delivery of tourism services and policies at the local level means that it is difficult to identify who has a key role in tourism and should be
involved and informed of changes at the regional level. R2 and R3 say that vertical communication links within LAs are poor and that they need to be communicating with a variety of people (Chief Executives and those people lower in the organisational hierarchy who are involved in delivering tourism services).

"it is so complicated working out who you need to be talking to at the LA in terms of tourism... It is quite difficult for us to intervene or to engage at the right level... (YF needs to) get smarter with who it actually talks to in terms of tourism" (R3).

The dynamic of the relationship between YF and Leeds is complex. In the interviews in 2004 it appeared that power was vested in the Region (in terms of resources) and that YF was authoritarian in its relationship with LAs. In 2005 there have been major changes in the personnel developing and delivering tourism policy at local and regional level. There has also been a power shift with LAs having a direct say in the regional structures and policies and being given the freedom to develop sub regional organisations. These structures vary across the Region and appear to reflect the lack of consensus about the nature and place of tourism policy e.g. R3 identifies that West Yorkshire has chosen to deliver policy through existing mechanisms which tie into the economic partnership, whereas other sub regions have delivered a variety of new organisational structures to market and manage tourism.

The implications of complexity are that it is difficult to identify tourism policy and to identify and communicate links between tourism and wider policies and initiatives. There is a general uncertainty and lack of understanding of the role of the LA in tourism and some evidence that tourism is being subsumed into wider policy initiatives with little explicit discussion or awareness.

Summary

This chapter considers interview material collected during 2004 and 2005 and identifies three key themes and six key characteristics of tourism. The first characteristic is low status and has contributed to the low budget and profile of tourism policy making and activity. The implications of low status have been identified in Leeds where there is not enough local research to underpin policy, a lack of strategic awareness, a lack of focus
on implementation, poor communication with other key policy makers, an inability to influence other policy makers and inactivity in the context of rapid change.

The second characteristic is the lack of clarity around the tourism role of LA, and nature of its policy making. The implications of the lack of clarity include a lack of awareness about the development and implementation of tourism policy and the place of tourism by strategic policy makers in the LA and Region. There is also a lack of awareness of the management issues arising from the decision to freeze the tourism manager’s post.

The third characteristic is uncertainty in the context of rapid change in local and regional policy environment and communication breakdown between LA and Region. The implications of uncertainty are inaction in tourism policy making at the local level, duplication of initiatives/conflicting objectives and inadequate communication.

The fourth characteristic is lack of consensus arising around the breakdown in communication around sub regional proposals and ML. The implication of the former was the review of approach to policy making with decision making powers shifted to the sub regions. An implication of this is the complex structures emerging at sub regional level. This has resulted in infrequent meetings between LAs and the Region which has led to a lack of trust and uncertainty. Lack of consensus around ML appears to have led to inactivity and indecision in respect of tourism policy and very poor communication between local officers.

The fifth characteristic is lack of congruence between initiatives at the regional and local level. Different initiatives have different boundaries and appear to cut across one another. The final characteristic is complexity and arises from the nature of tourism policy and the difficulties in separating it from wider issues, and trying to understand the way that it connects into a wide range of other policy areas. The implications of complexity are that key policy makers do not understand what tourism policy is or how it fits and that tourism policy not being enacted or implemented because it is not clear how to do this. In the next chapter the themes and characteristics identified above will be considered in the light of wider literature and primary research.
CHAPTER 8 EVALUATION

Introduction

Chapter 7 was presented as two narratives developed from the interviews with policy makers in Leeds in 2004 and 2005 which were structured around three key themes. These themes were dominant in the explanations of the practice of tourism policy making in Leeds. At the end of Chapter 7, six common characteristics were identified that arose across, and connected the theme areas.

In this Chapter further consideration is given to the nature and dimensions of the three themes and then the six characteristics in an attempt to develop an understanding of the contextual factors that affect tourism policy in Leeds. The findings from the narratives in Chapter 7 are evaluated in the context of the literature on tourism policy, complexity and wider policy theory (Chapters 2-4) the historical analysis of tourism policy making in England (Chapter 4) and in Leeds (Chapter 6) and the RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001). In addition the narratives are considered in the context of another LA using the primary research material from Cambridge. The findings of the research are considered in terms of their implications on the practice or enactment of tourism policies identifying paradoxes in the wider environment and in tourism policy making at the local level. The findings of the study are also considered in terms of their implications for theorising and conceptualising tourism policy making.

The interviews presented in this Chapter were carried out in Cambridge and occurred in phase two of the research process. The interviewees are identified as C1-C5 in this section and the interviews were transcribed and were coded in the same way as in the Leeds study (see Chapter 5 for more details of the process and Appendix 7 for the background to the case study area). This phase provided insights into developing codes, concepts and themes in Leeds.
Exploring the nature and dimensions of the themes identified in Leeds

Perpetual change

The Leeds narratives identified perpetual change, in the policy environment, and in the structures, policies and politics and key policy makers within the LA. Change is a characteristic of tourism policy in Cambridge with local organisational change and the decision to move the tourism service from Policy and Projects to Economic Development and City Centre Management. These changes have impacted on tourism policy making and delivery and have directed the service toward front line service delivery and away from longer-term policy development (C2). Tourism policy has been refocused away from environmental and development issues and towards developing and delivering a marketing strategy (C1, C2). The Cambridge interviews indicate some changes at the regional level but these have minimal direct impact on local policy making and service delivery. In Cambridge the tourism manager is relatively senior and has the potential to link tourism services and policies into the wider decision making process which means that policy makers in Cambridge have a relatively clear idea about the place of tourism in relation to other services and the direction of tourism policy over the next year.

The policy environment in Leeds is very turbulent which is illustrated by the changes that occurred between the interviews in 2004 and 2005. This included a change in the political leadership of the Council, changes in key personnel at local and regional level, organisational flux and uncertainty at regional level as well as a major change in the approach to policy development and delivery at regional level. The policy environment in Leeds is also extremely complex illustrated by the plethora of the partnership arrangements and networks around the delivery of the Vision, coupled with the introduction of ML, the policy and organisational proposals relating to tourism from YF and the YTB, the City Region Initiative and the Northern Way. As a result of this turbulence and complexity, tourism policy making in Leeds is characterised by uncertainty and a lack of clarity and the interviewees are unable to say what or where tourism policy will be in 12 months time.
Relationships and communication

Within the LA in Cambridge, the relationships between tourism and different aspects of economic development appear to be strong but the relationships between tourism and culture appear to be relatively weak. In the past the links between tourism and land use planning have been strong but this changed when a tourism officer was employed with a wider remit in 2003. While the structure for the delivery of tourism services in Cambridge is relatively straightforward, there are difficulties in developing and maintaining partnerships with some accommodation providers and the Colleges. C1, and C2 identify limited interest by local stakeholders in tourism policy unless there are major problems to overcome or direct benefits to them. C2 claims that previously good models of cooperation have “fallen by the wayside” because private partners do not see anything immediate in it for them. Partnership mechanisms “have tended to break down because the industry is not bringing anything to them” (C2).

In Cambridge the relationship between the LA and the Colleges has varied over time but is currently very weak with discussion fora and implementation mechanisms having “become moribund” (C2). In 2004 C1, C2 and C5 reported that they had not engaged in any direct discourse for 3 years because there were no major issues to discuss, and no political will to discuss tourism issues. The independent hoteliers communicate with the LA but it is difficult to engage the managers in the ‘chain’ owned hotels on the basis that they change jobs frequently and do not perceive any benefits in developing a relationship with the LA (C2).

In the tourism literature review in Chapter 2 the contributions of network and stakeholder theory were discussed. These approaches identify policy emerging from a variety of informal and formal associations or ‘policy communities’. Tyler and Dinan (2001a&b) identify the changing nature of the policy community at the national level, including the growing importance of private sector interests in developing and delivering tourism policy. At the local level in Leeds the interest in tourism as a policy and service area has fluctuated over the past 29 years. Historical analysis in Chapter 6 (Stevenson, 2005) identifies five phases characterised by activity at the beginning, followed by setback and relative inactivity at the end of each phase. In this context it is very difficult to identify an established or continuous policy community around tourism issues at the local level.
Even in Cambridge where there is a 28 year history of tourism policy making, there does not appear to be the mechanism or impetus to maintain and support a tourism policy community.

While the interviews in Leeds and Cambridge clearly indicate different associations of people have developed tourism policy, these associations have differed in each LA. In Leeds, tourism policy was developed under the Vision and the CS and in Cambridge tourism policy was developed by the Policy and Projects team and was associated with land use planning policy. In both LAs there is evidence of engagement with the private sector during the development of a tourism strategy, in Leeds that engagement still exists through the Tourism Forum however the Forum does not directly develop or implement the strategy and does not link into other policy mechanisms. In Cambridge the ‘policy community’ that was associated with the Tourism Strategy developed in 2001 no longer exists and there is no direct discussion between the Council and the Colleges about the implementation of policies.

Exploring the nature and dimensions of the characteristics

*Low status*

Tourism policy making and service provision is characterised by its low status in Cambridge which is attributed to its non-statutory nature by C1, C2 and C4. “At local authority level, the financial support is fairly tight and is a non-statutory service and so it is always vulnerable to cuts and changes” (C1).

Tourism "just comes a long way down the list...we are reluctant to spend anything on tourism to be honest because of the huge pressures elsewhere" (C4).

The low status of tourism in Cambridge is compounded by a number of factors at the local level including the reluctance of the Colleges about their role as an attraction (C3, C5) and the concerns expressed by residents about the negative effects of tourism. (C1, C2 and C4). Local councillors are concerned that they subsidise tourism through the provision of tourism services, but claim they see few benefits in their City that is characterised by low unemployment and a successful varied economy. The visibility of
negative impacts of tourism and the lack of clarity about any positive impacts means the local politicians are either reluctant or ambivalent about tourism in the City. (C1, C2 & C4) This ambivalence is exacerbated by the low status of tourism in national policy making, and the lack of any statutory responsibility or targets for tourism services (C1, C2 & C4).

The low status is reinforced by the funding arrangements with money directed at national and regional level marketing initiatives that do not link clearly to LA priorities.

"(Tourism) is funded in a very fragile way by local authorities and commercial activity, local authorities don’t have to do it if they choose not to. It is quite fragile at the sharp end and it is difficult to deliver a good service in that state" (C1).

Low status is particularly relevant to understanding the practice of tourism policy in England. This is illustrated by changes in the wider policy environment that have particularly impacted upon non statutory services such as tourism. For example the modernisation agenda, requires LAs to make improvements in the context of financial constraint and increased local accountability. This severely impacts upon tourism services at the local level in both Cambridge and Leeds (C1, C2, C4, L6, L8, L9 and R1) on the basis that there is increased pressure to improve the delivery of other services, which have a statutory or compulsory status or where local residents express an interest.

The marginality and low status of tourism policy as an area of government activity is evident in the wider literature on policy making and political ideology. There are few references to tourism policy in the public policy making literature and the review of literature about ideology, governance and modernisation (including Giddens 1998, 1999; Hambleton 1995, Hill 1997, Midwinter, 200; Parston & Timmins, 1998; Richards & Smith 2002; Stoker 2004, and Stoker & Wilson, 2004) reveals a lack of ideological thought or debate relating to tourism policy development in England. It is difficult to connect tourism policies with rightist or leftist ideology because ideological considerations do not clearly underpin the actions of government when they develop policies or advice on tourism.
In the tourism literature Elliot (1997) contends that tourism has not normally been a matter of dispute between political parties and the historical analysis in Chapter 4 highlights the extent to which approaches to tourism have remained remarkably constant in a variety of political contexts. Hall (2000) draws from Simeon 1976, Hall & Jenkins (1995) and Elliot (1997) illustrating the extent to which public policy making is essentially a "political activity" (2000:8). However in the context of this study tourism policy is political in an implicit sense i.e. it occurs in a political context and is affected by power relationships. Tourism is not political in terms of party politics, and is not directly included within the ideological debates that are occurring in the wider policy environment. This contrasts with the clearer and more explicit relationship between ideology and party politics and other areas of public policy provision for example housing, education and social welfare.

The relationship between tourism policy and politics is complex because changes in the political environment and ideology (e.g. governance and modernisation) have indirect impacts upon tourism policy making at the local level. These often arise as the knock on effects of other initiatives (such as the initiatives arising from the modernisation agenda, the agenda to devolve policy making activities to the regions and to involve more people in public policy making through the development of local strategic partnerships etc).

Lack of clarity

In Cambridge it is clear where tourism fits within the LA organisational structure and it has recently been linked to economic development and city management. However there is less clarity about the benefits of tourism that is attributed to the lack of guidance from national government and inconsistent and inadequate data on tourism at all levels (C1, C2 and C4).

"We don't have any performance indicators from the government on what we should be doing with our tourism...when it comes up to the budget round and we look at all the targets that we must meet like planning applications, public transport - they have performance indicators, therefore we spend money on them... Tourism, we do out of goodwill, there aren't any performance indicators, and there is no reason for us to be spending money on tourism" (C4).
C1 and C2 contend that it is difficult for LAs to understand how to engage in tourism policy and service delivery in the absence of a clear structure of how tourism is managed and organised at a regional or national level. C1 claims it is difficult to collect information on the health of the tourism economy at the local level. This leads to a lack of clarity about the benefits of tourism and some scepticism that tourism adds anything to an already successful economy. Tourism is perceived in terms of direct short term costs rather than its long term or wider benefits.

"At the moment it is effectively a loss to us...In purely financial terms we would get rid of it" (C4).

In Cambridge and Leeds, C1 and L6 identify the difficulties in collecting information on occupancy rates, as hotel operators will not provide this information to LAs. Benchmarking provides some baseline data but these are inconsistent and it is difficult to make comparisons between areas because

"every place does things differently it is very difficult to get a true model or something to compare yourself to" (C1).

The discussion about relationships and communication earlier in this Chapter introduced the issues arising about the lack of a continuous, or active policy community around tourism issues at local level. In Leeds this contrasts sharply with other policy areas such as economic regeneration, cultural policy and city image where there are strong and diverse policy communities. These policy areas are potentially linked to tourism but this link is not explicitly expressed as it is not reflected in the interests of the policy groups and is "not in people's minds" (L2). There is lack of clarity about tourism policy and the dominant policy communities are not making connections between tourism and their policy areas. The issues about lack of clarity are strongly linked with the low status of tourism and are characterised by the lack of representation of key tourism decision makers in the most influential policy groups. An example of this is the lack of involvement of the tourism managers in the Cultural Partnership (CP) an influential group overseeing the implementation of the CS). In 2004 L3 says that the tourism
manager was not initially invited to participate in the group and in 2005 the manager charged with overseeing tourism policy was not included in the group.

The lack of clarity about the nature and role of tourism policy is evident within the tourism literature. Chapter 2 identifies the diversity of approaches, theories and concepts that have been used to conceptualise tourism policy making. There is no universally agreed or dominant approach to conceptualising or theorising tourism policy. It is not clear what tourism policy is and how it relates to other policies or wider public policy studies. A number of theorists call for research using multiple approaches in order to understand tourism policy making (Dredge & Jenkins, 2003; John, 1998; Pforr, 2005; Treuren & Lane, 2003 and Tyler & Dinan 2001a&b) and argue that single approaches offer partial accounts of political action and fail to explain policy change. Farrell & Twining Ward (2004), Hall (1997, 2000), McKercher (1999), Russell & Faulkner (1999), Twining Ward (2002) and Tyler & Dinan (2001b) bring chaos and complexity theory into the literature and contend that these theories challenge dominant orthodoxies and raise fundamental questions about the way tourism is conceptualised. However in the absence of a dominant approach or orthodoxy, tourism research is characterised by a plethora views and approaches. This results in a range of interesting studies rather than a coherent body of knowledge.

Survey information from Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) indicates that the relationship between national and local policy in England does not have the clarity suggested in the text books by Hall (2000), or in the Australian context illustrated by articles by Dredge & Jenkins (2003) and Pforr (2005). When asked whether national policy (Tomorrow’s Tourism) had influenced local tourism policy only 40% of LA tourism policy makers said it had some influence. The remaining 60% were either unable to say or stated that it had not influenced policy. This indicates that in the English context, there is not a clear hierarchical relationship with national policy filtering down and influencing local policy. The weakness of this relationship is likely to arise from the non-statutory nature of policy i.e. if national government does not require or fund local tourism policy making then it has little scope to affect policy at this level.
Uncertainty

In Cambridge, C1, C2 and C4 highlight the uncertainties about the place of tourism policy in the wider policy environment. At the sub regional level the County Council has cut the funding for its tourism services and at the regional level there is minimal communication between the RDA, RTB and LA. The region is focused on the coastal resorts and has not provided funding or advice to support the development and delivery of the City's tourism policy (C1 and C2).

"I don't think it (the RDA) has had any effect whatsoever... it is my experience that they might as well not be there" (C2).

C2 highlights the uncertainty about the development of sustainability indicators for tourism claiming that policy makers at the national level have "gone quiet" and that LAs are waiting for guidance. C1 draws attention to the structural changes at national level and the resulting confusion about roles and responsibilities in tourism policy making.

"there are structural (issues), which are to do with who has responsibility for dealing with tourism. Is it local authorities? Is it local business? Is it RDA's? Is it Regional Tourist Boards? Is it Visit Britain? Who has what role? And that seems still to be in a state of flux at the moment. Everyone is vying for their own position and seeing where the gaps are" (C1).

In both LAs the organisational arrangements for delivering tourism services have changed and in Leeds they are continuing to change as a consequence of the new leadership, the development of ML and regional changes. The Leeds study demonstrates the implications of the combination of turbulence, low status and lack of clarity. The key officers with a tourism role are uncertain about what will happen in the next few months and how the LA will engage in tourism policy and service delivery in the future. They are not sure whether the LA will be directly engaging in tourism policy making and service delivery or whether this will be contracted out and whether they as individuals will continue to be involved in tourism service delivery. In this context they can only deliver services on a short term and relatively reactive basis until decisions are made at a higher level. In Leeds a pro-active approach to tourism policy has been
suspended, and thinking about tourism and its fit in wider initiatives can not move forward until decisions are made at a higher level.

Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) highlight the uncertainty at the local level about how LA's should be engaging in tourism policy and also about the benefits and influence of tourism policy in local areas. When tourism managers with a tourism policy statement were asked whether their areas had benefited from having a tourism policy statement 46% agreed, but 54% were either unable to say or stated that local tourism policy had not benefited the area. In the context of uncertainties in the wider environment the majority of tourism managers are unable to identify links between their policy and benefits to the area. This questions of the logic of spending time and money developing formal tourism policy and requires further investigation.

*Lack of consensus*

In Cambridge there is a lack of consensus about the benefits of tourism arising from its obvious negative affects and less obvious positive affects due to difficulties in measuring the economic benefits. C4 and C5 are sceptical that tourists add much to a City that is already thriving.

"We have a lot of people who come over for the day...people doing fast track U.K....leaving London in the morning and getting to York in the evening and Cambridge is on route. So they tend to come into Cambridge with a thermos and their packed lunch. They don't buy anything to eat, they will probably buy a postcard and that is it. So if you equate the inconvenience that they cause versus the income that we get they are very poor value" (C4).

Tourism policy in Cambridge aims to convert day visitors into staying visitors and there seems to be consensus within the LA that this is the best way forward. The Colleges who do not want to extend their opening hours to support this policy do not support this view. The Colleges are not enthusiastic about their role as tourism attractions and see tourism as "a necessary evil" (C5).
In the wider tourism literature interpretations of tourism policy as a positive aspect that engenders consensus are dominant Gunn (2002) and WTO (1994). However research by Bramwell & Sharman (1999), Elliot (1997), Ladkin & Bertramini (2002) Treuren & Lane (2003) and Tyler and Dinan (2001b) illustrate that tourism policy is enacted within a changing contested arena with different groups of people vying for position. The interviews in Leeds illustrate the lack of consensus around the development and delivery of tourism policy and draws attention to power, and the implications of lack of power in the policy process.

**Lack of congruence**

In Cambridge there does not appear to be a lack of congruence between tourism initiatives and policies developed at the national, regional and local level. In Cambridge interviewees discussed their policy in the context of national rather than regional tourism policies. This may be a result of the lack of regional funding for tourism initiatives in Cambridge (C1, C3, C4). The wider literature highlights differences in the funding allocations and staffing levels in the different RDA’s which has implications for their ability to develop and enact policy. Funding is focussed on the northern regions with the consequence that regional tourism policy is stronger in the North.

**Complexity**

The development and delivery of tourism services are characterised by complexity in Cambridge. Specifically the interviews in Cambridge highlight the complexity arising from the organisational and policy changes at the national level and the variety of structures and policies emerging to deliver tourism services and policies.

Leeds is characterised by complexity at all levels. At the local level in the tourism policy arena this complexity is illustrated by the uncertainty about where tourism fits within the local structures and services, the variety of departments and organisations that provide services and make policies with a tourism element and the constant change in roles and responsibilities. This is exacerbated by the multitude of changing roles and relationships between private and public sector organisations, local strategic partnership and the development of ML. At the regional level there is complexity arising from the major
changes, in tourism delivery structures, policies and plans. This has been exacerbated by rapid changes in the staffing of the tourism policy arena and has led to fragmented and dynamic changes in the relationships between different people and service areas across different spatial scales. The next section will discuss complexity using the key concepts identified in Chapter 3.

The first concept is the complex adaptive system which highlights the extent that action within a certain sphere influences and is influenced by its environment. The notion of a complex adaptive system is at odds with the simple systems theory that is characterised by Leiper (1979, 1990) and Mill & Morrison (1985) in the tourism literature and has been criticised by Farrell & Twining Ward (2004) and Twining Ward (2002) who advocate complex systems thinking. Complexity theorists such as Stacey (2000, 2001, 2003) Shaw (2002) and Foseca (2002) go further, rejecting systems thinking as a way of understanding phenomena which are characterised by social action and interaction.

For this study the notion of complex systems is useful in broad terms in highlighting the extent and nature of interaction involved in the tourism policy process and the complexity of those interactions. In particular it draws attention to the idea of competition between policy areas, between locality and region, locality and locality, locality and central government policy and between different programmes at any level i.e. funding for ML verses the sub regional agenda. Tourism policy at the local level results from the interplay of all these interactions which are influenced by cooperation or competition between people.

The second concept is emergence, which draws attention to the relationship between the variety of interactions between policy makers at the local and regional level and their implications on tourism policy. The narratives illustrate the extent that people develop common stories to interpret events. Stories about the local and regional relationships are reiterated by a number of players during the interviews in 2004 and 2005. There is a clear sense of progression as events are re-iterated and re-interpreted in the light of emerging events or contextual changes. Specific events that occurred in 2004 either appear to become more peripheral or more important in the interviews in 2005. For example in the 2005 interviews one specific meeting is ascribed as the key meeting or trigger point for many of the changes in personnel and the new approach that was
developed in 2004. This meeting occurred before the first set of interviews but at this stage it was not identified or interpreted as a key meeting but merely as one of many frustrating and difficult meetings.

In the narratives two stories or 'truths' emerge about the regional proposals and the changing relationships between the locality and the region. One reflects the views of the local policy makers and the other reflects the views of the regional policy makers. They share common parts and events but interpret those events in different ways illustrating collective behaviour and views developing within of groups of policy makers. For example at the regional level there is a common story about the process of developing proposals for sub regional DMO's which includes the same colloquial expressions such as YF "got their fingers burnt" (R2, R3). These two 'truths' are at variance and the differences in the viewpoints are unresolved and still in tension in 2005.

The third concept is the edge of chaos (Battram, 1999; Tosey, 2002) or the zone of complexity (Stacey 2000, 2001, 2003) which refers to the transition phase where there is a tension between order and disorder, stability and instability, and predictability and unpredictability. In this study the latter term is most appropriate to describe the characteristics and tensions within the tourism policy environment. The main problem with the term chaos is that it is overly dramatic, value laden and it encourages the researcher to look for the headlines or the extremes. The zone of complexity is more neutral and provides the space to consider the array of tensions, contradictions and paradoxes that characterise tourism policy making in Leeds. This is important in the context of the study where the important relationships, dynamics and issues are often those that are less tangible and less explicit. The interviews with policy makers draw attention away from the headlines, and the tangible aspects of the policy process and towards the relationships and communication that characterise policy making in a marginal and non statutory area of LA service provision.

In Leeds many of the policies which are aiming to change local policy making and service delivery originate from national government and are associated with governance and modernisation and with ideological developments which have affected all major parties. In the wider environment it is possible to identify an order to these ideological and policy developments with 'third way' ideology clearly developing from and as a
response to 'neo-liberalism' and modernisation as the latest iteration of policies associated with governance. (Giddens 1998, 1999; Hill, 1997a; Parston & Timmins, 1998; Richards and Smith, 2002 and Stoker & Wilson 2004). There is also a disorder arising from the tensions and paradoxes presented by the modernisation agenda such as the call for more local accountability at the same time as initiatives by the centre to closely control the statutory activities of LAs (Bowerman & Ball, 2000; Leach, 2004 and Richards & Smith, 2002).

In terms of wider policy at the local level in Leeds, there is an order arising from the development of the LI as the partnership organisation for the City in 1990 and evolving into the LSP in accordance with national policy. The role of this partnership organisation is relatively stable and longstanding and it has worked closely with business and a variety of key politicians and officers within the LA to develop the Vision at the top of a clear hierarchy of strategies and plans. At the same time specifically in relation to tourism policy there is disorder arising from its low status, lack of representation on the cultural partnership and the loss of a dedicated tourism manager meaning that there is not a representative or champion for tourism on the more powerful policy groups. Hence the mechanism for implementing tourism strategy in the context of higher level policies is not operational.

The tensions arising in the zone of complexity highlight the inadequacies of the traditional approaches to developing tourism policy in a complex and turbulent environment that is characterised by paradox. For example in Leeds the TSL has been developed using what Darwin (2001) calls a traditional "toolkit" of methods, using the techniques identified in the tourism texts such as Godfrey & Clarke (2000) Inskeep (1991) WTO (1994) including destination analysis using SWOT, basic product analysis and market analysis. The historic analysis in Chapter 6 shows that the TSL has a clear place in the policy hierarchy and links into other plans and strategies in the reports and strategies of the Council.

A study that focussed on TSL might conclude that traditional methods are appropriate and useful as a way of understanding tourism policy in Leeds. However from the perspective of policy makers the tourism policy process is characterised by opportunism, reaction to events in the wider environment, muddling through and responding to
changes and has more in common with some of the characteristics of "garbage-can decision making" (Zimmerman et al., 1998). The interviews illustrate the extent to which the TSL provides a tangible output of the LA's views and aspirations about tourism at a specific time but is outside of the main policy system. In 2004 only L2 and L6 discuss this strategy and all other key policy makers perceive tourism policy in terms of the Council's broader policies. By 2005 none of the key policy makers acknowledge or refer to the TSL. While a strategy exists as a tangible manifestation of policy it is no longer relevant or important to policy makers who appear to have forgotten about it.

The fourth concept is the policy landscape which is useful in terms of understanding policy interventions being embedded in the larger policy landscape. Battram (1999), and Blackman (2001) identify the LA landscape as very "rugged" with little capacity within LA's for policy making in the context of controls by CG. The non-statutory nature of tourism has the potential to reduce its ruggedness in that there are no direct controls or performance standards from National Government. However within the Leeds study it is clear that in 2004 the tourism manager had low status and limited ability to develop and implement policy. By 2005 the tourism manager's post was vacant, frozen and had been largely subsumed into Development Services where it formed a small part of the role of several managers. In this context the tourism policy environment is extremely rugged and the tourism manager is unable to be proactive in developing and implementing policy. The ruggedness of the policy landscape starts to explain the paradox that there is no change in tourism policy despite the rapid change in the wider environment. This will be discussed later in this Chapter.

The fifth concept is positive feedback and draws attention to the implications of a variety of complex interrelationships and interactions between the LA, YTB, YF and national government. There are a vast array of policies and initiatives from each of these organisations many of which are pulling in different directions, have different boundaries and appear to be cutting across one another. An example of this would be the support given by one part of YF to ML which is based upon Leeds at the centre of the City Region taking the lead on developing its own marketing approach and brand. This appears to create tensions and contradict the Regional Tourism Strategy and the role of YTB in marketing the region.
Positive feedback questions theoretical assumptions upon which much tourism policy theory is based, in particular the straightforward and linear links between cause and effect presented in Inskeep (1991) WTO (1994), Godfrey & Clark (2000) Veal (2002) and Gunn (2002). Another example of positive feedback relates to the decision by YF to deliver tourism services via sub regional DMO's. The relatively inexperienced YF assumed that the devolution of tourism to the regions and their control over tourism resources gave them clear and direct powers to impose a structure for tourism service delivery without the agreement of the LA's. Their approach ignored local politics, historic rivalries, views, aspirations and working arrangements for tourism. YFs decision to present the proposed structures as a 'fait accomplis' was counterproductive and led to LAs becoming more entrenched in their opposition to the proposal. As a result YF had to back-track and allocate considerable powers back to the LAs.

The sixth concept is co-evolution which highlights the process of brokering or negotiating between different tensions which is integral to the policy making process. The examples outlined in the previous section emphasise that these negotiations are not rational and reflect the wider power structures, cultures and relationships. Co-evolution draws attention to the difficulties in identifying a tourism policy system on the basis that the policy process is fundamentally about interactions between people. Those interactions are influenced by a range of ideals, beliefs and values that fall outside of traditional simple systems identified by Gunn (2002) Mill & Morrison (1985) and Lieper (1979,1990).

In the Leeds example if the tourism policy system is identified as the interactions and components of tourism policy, analysis will underplay the complex relationships and power relations between policy makers in tourism and other policy areas. If the system is widened to include these relationships then the analysis is likely to underplay the complex relationships and power relations between LCC and its neighbouring authorities, YF, YTB and national government. If the system is widened to include these relationships and power relations, as in the model developed by Easton (1965) and translated into the tourism policy arena by Hail (1994, 2000) then the nuances of the detailed local story become lost. The local story includes the narratives of individual policy makers trying to do their best in a complex and uncertain environment, negotiating and making alliances with people.
The seventh concept is *connectivity*, which highlights the importance of connections and interactions within policy environment. Connectivity is a key concept in relation to tourism policy, which in Leeds is "not separated out from the overall thrust of policy" (L2). Tourism policy and activities are implicit and explicit within a range of policies, from the Vision down to the CS and Leeds UDP. While a separate tourism strategy document exists it is largely unrecognised by key policy makers who perceive tourism policy in terms of the higher level policies. The highest level policy, the Vision, has 3 main objectives that do not explicitly relate to tourism, but L1, L2, L3, L4 and L6, L8 and L9 make links between the broad objectives and tourism.

Connectivity highlights the importance of interactions between people making and enacting policies. In Leeds there is a dynamism caused by changes to the political leadership and the roles of councillors arising from the 2004 election, organisational changes in 2003 and changes in the staffing and roles of existing officers. In Leeds change is the norm and the policy community is constantly changing. As new people join the policy community the dynamics and relationships change. In discretionary areas like tourism the individual personalities, characteristics and alliances of tourism policy makers can push tourism up or down the political agenda. Chapter 6 provides some evidence that the cycles of tourism policy might be linked to "champions" who have been particularly successful in communicating the benefits of tourism to a wider audience in the Council, local businesses and the local community. The dynamic nature of changes in the policy networks means that things are unlearned and forgotten in a short time scale. This is particularly evident in Leeds where the Council leadership changed, and the tourism manager's post was frozen at local and regional level during the study period. Between the interviews in 2004 and 2005 people forgot about the TSL and refocused their interest on ML.

**The implications of the themes and characteristics for the development and delivery of tourism policies**

The research conducted for this study indicates that in Leeds tourism policy;

1. takes place in a rapidly changing environment;
2. has low status and lacks clarity occurring on the margins of LA policy with minimal resources;
3. is intricately connected with other policies, is implicit in many policy documents and can not be separated from other policy areas;
4. involves communication between many people in a variety of different organisations; and
5. is enacted by partnerships and networks of organisations and the boundaries of those organisations are always changing and sometimes blurred or indistinct.

The themes and characteristics outlined in the previous section give rise to a number of contradictions and paradoxes in the practice or enactment of tourism policy. In the next section these will be discussed and evaluated in the wider policy environment, where they have a broad relevance and resonance to LA policy making and at local level where they are specifically relevant to tourism policy making in Leeds.

**Paradox and contradiction in the LA policy environment**

This section will consider paradoxes and contradictions identified in the wider literature and the RELAT survey and then those that specifically relate to tourism policy making in Leeds. In the wider literature a number of writers including Tichelar & Watts (2000), Leach (2004), Stoker & Wilson (2004) identify the paradoxical situation of LAs in developing new management styles and approaches.

"On the one hand central/local government relationships, which are prescriptive and regulatory, have generated an increasing need for internal command and control, particularly in relations to budgetary constraint and performance management. On the other hand local authorities are under pressure to introduce more flexible and devolved management arrangements to meet the demands of globalism and public responsiveness. These conflicting pressures have contributed to the development of more complex paradoxical roles in local authorities" (Tichelar & Watts 2000: 225).

The tensions between performance management and public involvement that affect most public services do not affect tourism services to a large extent on the basis that
there are no performance standards (C4) and the public are generally apathetic about local tourism services (L3 & L4). However these broader tensions directly affect tourism services because they focus the policy makers' attention on managing the changes and the paradoxes arising from the change process in the areas where they will be monitored by national government and where good performance will be rewarded by funding. They focus attention away from tourism.

"Tourism, we do out of goodwill, there aren't any performance indicators, and there is no reason for us to be spending money on tourism...we are reluctant to spend anything on tourism to be honest because of the huge pressures elsewhere" (C4).

The tensions outlined above are connected to the second paradox that tourism policy making occurs within a political environment but is not “political” and is not subject to political debate or of interest to politicians. The connection between political ideology and tourism policy is complex. While policy is developed within a political arena it is unusually a-political. Tourism is led by sub state agencies, at national level, non elected RDA’s and at local level largely driven by officers (C4). Tyler & Dinan (2001b) outline the extent to which private sector interests have become more powerful at national level and Tomaney (2004) indicates that this has also occurred at regional level. In LCC private sector interests have become more involved in local policy making, through the LI and the newly developed ML. Local community interests have remained on the periphery in local tourism policy making and unlike other policy arenas community consultation is not a statutory part of the planning process. The study shows that tourism is characteristically a-political, with broad party support or apathy depending upon the characteristics of the area, widespread public apathy, and delivery by agencies. However it occurs in an environment that is characterised by political and ideological debate and competition.

A contradiction is apparent from the findings of the RELAT survey (Stevenson & Lovatt, 2001) indicating that the number of LAs engaging in tourism policy making is increasing at the same time as the resources are remaining constant and research by Fyall (2006) indicates that resources have decreased. Some LAs appear to be making tourism policy and delivering services on budgets of under £10,000 (Stevenson & Lovatt 2001) which
begs questions about the nature of the policy making process. How is policy made with such limited resources? How much, and what sort of local research is undertaken? Do other organisations contribute data and funding? Who funds the implementation of policies and how are the monitoring mechanisms funded?

One explanation of this was provided by R1 who commented that in the absence of adequate resources and research that tourism policy makers "pick pieces of other people's policies that sound good" without undertaking their own local research. This suggests that tourism policy is developed using ad-hoc approaches without a local evidence base and is developed from policy documents in other areas. The implication of this is that there is minimal debate about the scope and objectives of tourism policy. Local tourism strategy in one area is likely to be influenced and perhaps even defined by what is happening elsewhere. This appears to be a pragmatic response to marginality and chronic under-funding rather than an example of "best practice".

Paradoxes and contradictions in tourism policy making in Leeds

There are several contradictions and paradoxes that are specific to Leeds and arise from the material collected from the policy makers.

**Paradox 1: Visible change signifies no change.**

In 2004 this is illustrated by comments from R1 and L5 about the reorganisation in 2003.

"Restructuring happens all the time in local authorities it rarely changes the decision making process. The fact is that they'll still continue to do what they have always done" (R1).

"I don't see any link between restructure and tourism policy and the way it might change or might be developing"(L5).

This is clearly illustrated when the LCC leadership changes for the first time in twenty four years in 2004 from Labour control, to an alliance between the Conservatives, the Liberal Democrats and the Green party. The election of a new leadership of LCC would
appear to imply change, however in practice the Vision and other key policy objectives have remained the same. There are a number of explanations for this including the approach adopted by the LI and local officers to securing cross party agreement to the Vision. While several interviewees including L1, L7 and L8 indicated that the change in political leadership might lead to "a different ethos and approach" (L1) the change is considered to be

"...a matter of emphasis of the detail ...rather than any fundamental changes to policy... the change in the administration hasn't particularly affected tourism at all, one way or the other" (L8).

The paradox is reflected in wider policy literature by Leach (2004) who identifies a lack of "real political choices" at the local level despite the apparent alternatives provided through party-based representative democracy. In Leeds, the agreement between political parties about the strategic direction of the City means that in practical terms there is very little to differentiate the parties at a local level. It helps to explain the smooth transition and minimal impacts arising from the change of LCC's leadership which is apparent in the 2005 interviews.

**Paradox 2: Successful change occurs without planning**

Several interviewees highlight the strong economic performance in Leeds without coordinated strategy in marketing.

“For the last 15 years we have been the fastest growing City in the UK, without having a coordinated marketing endeavour" (L1).

In the same way tourism has grown and been relatively successful in the City without the guidance of a tourism strategy. The tourism sector has developed as the business sector has grown and changed, and is related to the strength in the economy as a whole. L7 highlights the reactive approach to hotel development in Leeds with the private sector having considerable freedom to respond to demand. One interpretation of this might be that tourism has been developed successfully without policy and does not
need to be managed. However the historical analysis (Stevenson, 2005) and the narratives indicates considerable informal or *backstage* activity (Darwin, 2001) in the period where no formal tourism strategy existed. The evidence collected for the Leeds study indicates that the tangible policies within formally adopted plans are far less important in enacting change than those intangible and unwritten policies and practices that evolve during the interactions and negotiations between policy makers.

**Paradox 3: Tourism policy remains static in the context of rapid change**

Rapid changes at the regional and local level have led to uncertainty about the place and future of tourism policy. At the end of 2004 the key tourism managers at local and regional level resigned and in the context of so much uncertainty the decision was made not to fill the posts. It is clear in 2005 that the LA has chosen to focus away from tourism service and policy delivery and let these ‘tick over’ until there is clarity about wider policies. As a result there are no direct developments in tourism policy (in the narrow sense of the development or implementation of strategy) or specific initiatives to implement any aspects of tourism policy. Tourism policy can only be said to be developing as a reaction to wider decisions in respect of the Vision, CS, economic policy and ML. The study indicates that change occurs at variable speeds within an organisation, which means in the midst of rapid change policy making in some parts of the organisation are static.

At the local level there is inactivity in terms of developing links between tourism and economic policy which is linked to wider contextual issues such as the budget cuts, the uncertainties associated with the development of ML, uncertainties about the proposed changes at regional level and the changes to the management of the tourism service.

This paradox is also apparent at the regional level in terms of the changes envisaged by YF. These include changes to the YTB and the intention to develop sub regional tourism delivery structures simultaneously in a rapid ‘step-change’ (R2, R3). However the disagreement about the sub-regional structures led to delays. In practice changes at the regional level are evolving at different speeds with stasis in some areas. R3 claims that “time is standing still really while these structures are sorted out”, highlighting policy areas that are relatively static in a period of rapid change. For example proposals to
changes in visitor information provision have been put on hold as they are considered to complicate the DMO debate.

Contradiction 1: The organisational and policy structures set up by YF contradict and cut across the structures developed by regional initiatives from ODPM.

In 2005 tourism policy is emerging from the Northern Way, the Regional level, the sub regional level and has the potential to emerge from the City Regions. The local interviewees including L2, L3, L4, L6, L7, L8 and L9 indicate that the sub regional structure recommended by YF takes no account of and cuts across other regional organisational and policy structures including the City Region and the Northern Way. The variety of regional and sub regional boundaries are illustrated in Appendix 6 and the sub regional proposals are perceived to contradict these initiatives.

Contradiction 2: The organisational structure and the policy hierarchy for tourism do not link together at the local level.

There are contradictory tensions in the organisational arrangements for tourism within LCC which do not reflect the policy hierarchy. Recent organisational changes have moved tourism from Leisure Services (with a direct role in delivering cultural policy) to Development Services (with a direct role in delivering regeneration policy). This has disconnected the tourism service from the formal mechanisms for delivering and implementing tourism policy.

The implications of the findings of the study for conceptualising and theorising tourism policy making

The themes and characteristics outlined in this study raise some questions about the dominant ways of conceptualising and theorising tourism policy which are discussed further below.
Tourism policy takes place in a rapidly changing and dynamic environment

The study shows that tourism policy takes place in a very dynamic environment. Due to its marginality and its non statutory nature, the level of activity around tourism policy fluctuates and is not continuous. The historical analysis demonstrates five phases of tourism activity characterised by enthusiasm and intense activity, followed by setback, followed by a lull in policy making with almost no activity, followed by renewed interest in tourism. Leeds is currently in a phase that is characterised by minimal activity following the resignation of the tourism manager and the decision to freeze the post. The fluctuating commitment from LA's to tourism is not specific to Leeds and is illustrated in Cambridge (C1, C2) and in a study of neighbouring Bradford Council (Hope & Klemm, 2001). In all cases fluctuations in commitment are linked with the non statutory nature of tourism and with the difficulty in collecting data that clearly articulates the contribution made by tourism to the local economy.

In Leeds tourism policy is affected by organisational changes, changes in personnel, new local initiatives which are connected to developments in the wider policy environment, including changes in the role and powers of YF, governance and modernisation, the City Region Initiative, the developments in local strategic partnerships and many more. The nature of the rapidly changing environment and paradoxes and tensions it creates, suggests that tourism planning can not be predicted or modelled in the way suggested by positivist models. Research should be developed within a theoretical framework that recognises and investigates its characteristics and paradoxes. Further research should be directed at the process of change and its implications over time, more in the style of some of the longitudinal studies in the wider literature e.g. Flyvbjerg's (1998) study of transport planning in Denmark illustrating the dynamic power shifts in the networks of people who influence and enact local policies.

Tourism policy takes place on the margins of LAs

The study indicates that LA tourism managers have minimal power and ability to control the policy environment. The most important characteristics affecting tourism policy making are outside control of the LA tourism manager and team. In Leeds in 2004 a dedicated officer was in post but she was relatively powerless to develop and enact
policy because she was not sufficiently senior in the organisational hierarchy. In 2005 the tourism manager's post was subsumed into Development Services, shared between different officers where it was not identified as a top priority. The low status of tourism policy in relation to other policy areas suggests further investigation using wider literature on power and politics.

**Tourism policy is intricately connected and cannot be separated from other policy areas**

The study shows that the enactment of tourism policy is not confined within a specific policy or organisational area and it is the result of a large number of different policy decisions made at local, regional and national level. Many of these are not directed specifically at tourism but have significant impacts on the tourism policy process i.e. modernisation agenda, development of cultural strategies in the early 2000's, economic regeneration initiatives such as UDC's in the 1980's.

Tourism policy is so intertwined with other policies that it makes little sense for it to be conceptualised as a separate activity. Tourism policy runs through and is implicit and explicit in other policy areas, and cannot be separated from other policy areas or policy documents. This study highlights the importance of understanding tourism policy in the context of the wider policy process and investigating the way it connects with other policy areas, and is represented in organisational structures. Studies need to be developed which take account of the varied, overlapping and sometimes indistinct organisational boundaries of tourism and understand how those arrangements work rather than taking tourism out of its context and creating boundaries between tourism and other policy areas.

**Tourism policy is essentially about communication**

The study shows how important people are in negotiating the shape and place of tourism policy. The interaction between these people is very relevant to the ongoing practice of tourism policy whereas the tangible policy is not particularly important. When policy makers discuss tourism they do not refer to the TSL but talk about the specific arrangements and initiatives in the recent past, the present and near future. They refer
to the implicit links with the higher policy objectives and the approaches adopted by the people involved in the process (some of whom are inclusive and successfully bring policy makers together and some of whom are perceived to exclude some interests).

The study shows how the TSL is not perceived to be important by policy makers and indicates that research that focuses on producing this document presents a partial picture and is limiting. The practice of tourism policy arises from interactions between people and the nature of these interactions are more important than the tangible tourism plan. This implies further study should be undertaken to understand the networks, communications and interactions surrounding tourism policy.

Tourism policy is affected by factors that are context specific

The study highlights the context specificity of tourism policy i.e. in two LA’s the structures and mechanisms for delivering tourism policy are different and the interviewees identify different policy contexts for the development of local policy (in particular the links between the LA and the region differ greatly). The context specificity of tourism policy making is supported by survey’s by Richards (1991) and Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) and case studies by Buckley & Witt, (1985) Hope & Klemm (2001), Kerr et al (2001) and Thomas & Thomas (1998). These draw attention to a variety of approaches to tourism policy making, linked to a diversity of organisational settings and local conditions.

The implication of context specificity on theorising and conceptualising tourism policy is that universal approaches to theorising and modelling are likely to be inappropriate as a way of developing understanding. This study supports the calls by Jafari (1986) and Kerr et al (2001) for case specific studies to develop thick description and improve understanding of tourism policy making and implementation in a specific context rather than attempting to develop universal models.

Paradoxes and contradictions are inherent in the policy environment and in the tourism policy process itself

The concept of the zone of complexity is useful here as it draws attention to the tensions and dynamic nature of policy and suggests that paradoxes can never be resolved. The
Leeds study highlights the apparently conflicting elements leading to paradoxes in tourism policy making at the local level and in the wider policy environment. These include, for example, the continuing tensions between individuals in LA departments, the LA and private sector interests, the local political parties, different policies and initiatives at the local, regional and national level, and the new delivery structures at the regional level. The tensions between these multiple factors are dynamic, complex and unpredictable.

The tangible components of tourism policy are not necessarily the most important

Tourism policy spans a range of policy areas and organisations, lacks clarity and status and occurs in a dynamic policy environment. The study shows that one of the implications of its complexity is that it is difficult to unpick and unpack the most important components and relationships. It is difficult to understand who is really making decisions and enacting policy and in this study the answers appear to lie in the stories about how individuals interact and work together. This suggests that stories about informal relationships, interests and rivalries might give much better insights into how people exert power and have more capacity to explain what happens in practice than the study of the more tangible processes and techniques involved in preparing a plan.

The study shows that the more tangible relationships are not necessarily the most important ones. For example the policy diagrams outlined in the Vision, the CS and TSL show clear hierarchical relationship between these strategies. However in the practical experience of policy makers these links do not exist. Tourism links to economic regeneration, and specifically to the Inward Investment team. The TSL exists as a tangible thing but it has ceased to have relevance or meaning to policy makers. Very little is explicit or is written about the relevant policy developments such as the development of ML and some implicit relationships that are developing between broader policies and tourism. These developments are far less tangible outside the network of key policy makers but are the most important enactments of tourism policy in Leeds.

In Leeds the most tangible changes appear to result in little or no change for tourism policy. An example of this is change in the leadership of the Council in 2004. At one
level the expectation would be that the Alliance of Conservative, Liberal Democrats and the Green Party would take a different direction to the previous administration, and that the approach to some policy making and delivery would change. However behind the scenes officers and key people in the LI envisaged the changes and developed relationships with the key members of the opposition in their negotiations about emerging policy. These negotiations are relatively intangible but are key to the policy process.

The characteristics identified above have major implications on the approach to thinking about and theorising tourism policy making. The tangible outputs of the tourism policy making such as written tourism policies say little about the realities of policy making process from the perspectives of policy makers. This questions the focus of much of the existing theory on the processes and techniques for producing a policy document. The study indicates that the issue is not how to make tangible tourism policy, but how to get tourism onto the local policy agenda. In order to do this tourism research needs to be directed at developing a more detailed and coherent understanding of how tourism relates and links into established policy making, to highlight some of the problems faced by tourism policy makers and to start to provide ideas and concepts to help tourism policy makers be more influential in a rugged and dynamic policy environment.

Tourism policy takes place in an environment that is characterised by interactions between people and is complex, fluid and changeable. At the local level in England researchers should be investigating the tourism within its public policy context rather than focussing on how to produce a tourism strategy and the objectives of tourism policy. There is a need to focus on an approach that develops understanding from a starting point of recognising the "problem" or the characteristics of tourism policy making. Those characteristics require a different type of research, focussing on developing understanding of tourism policy making as a complex and multi faceted phenomena and which is characterised by interactions and communications between people. Research needs to be focussed on developing an understanding of the network of connections between people and policies as they change and develop over time.
Summary

This chapter investigates the themes and characteristics identified in the two narratives in the context of the wider literature and primary research. It identifies contradictions and paradoxes in the LA policy environment and in tourism policy making in Leeds. It discusses the implications of rapid change, marginality, connections, communication, context specificity, intangibility and the inherence of paradoxes and contradictions. The next chapter will consider the implications of the findings upon tourism policy theory development and for developing methodological approaches to social phenomena taking account of complexity, multiple perspectives, contradiction and change. It also will outline some of the practical implications of the research.
CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSION

This study investigates the factors that influence tourism policy in LCC from the perspectives of the people involved in the process. It draws from interview material collected during 2004 and 2005 and wider research and identifies three themes and six characteristics that influence tourism policy in Leeds. It then considers the nature of dimensions of the themes and characteristics, their relative importance and their relationships. This chapter concludes the study discussing the implications of the research findings for the broader theoretical debates about tourism planning and policy making. It identifies its methodological contribution outlining its approach to developing a research methodology from views of policy makers that encompasses complexity and turbulence.

The key themes and characteristics

The first theme is *perpetual change*, characterised by changes that explicitly affect tourism policy making in Leeds including the adoption of a CS and TSL in 2002, the Council reorganisation in 2003, the reorganisation of the tourism services into the Inward Investment Team in early 2005, the devolution of the strategic function of tourism to the regions in 2003 and the regional/sub regional proposals. There are also changes in the wider policy environment that have not had any direct effects at present but are likely to affect tourism policy in the future such as the change in leadership in 2004, the development of ML in 2004 and 2005 and the wider modernisation and regionalisation initiatives. As a result of this rapid change, there is a divergence between the mechanisms for developing and delivering tourism policies that are stated in the Vision, CS and TSL and the approaches discussed by interviewees. The tourism service is focussed on front line services with policy directed toward marketing objectives rather than the broader sustainability and regeneration objectives stated in their policy documents. Changes in the wider environment have led to a much narrower marketing approach being adopted towards tourism policy making than is implied in the TSL.

The second and third themes are *relationships and communication* and highlight the importance of interactions and negotiations between policy makers in the enactment of tourism policy. The implementation of tourism policy reflects the strength and position of
the champion(s) for tourism and their ability to influence other policy makers in more important and well established areas.

The first characteristic is low status, which has arisen largely as a result of the non-statutory nature of tourism and has contributed to the low budget and profile of tourism policy making and activity. The implications of low status include minimal local research to underpin policy, a lack of strategic awareness, a lack of focus on implementation, poor communication between tourism policy makers and key policy makers, an inability to influence other policy makers and inactivity in the context of rapid change. While tourism policy occurs within a political environment, it is not of political interest and falls outside political debate. Tourism policy is driven by officers (L2, C4) and so rather than Hall’s (2000) contention that tourism policy is what governments choose to do or not to do, tourism policy is more specifically what officers (tourism professionals) are able to do within the constraints and confines of the wider environment.

The second characteristic is the lack of clarity about role of LA in respect to tourism policy making. The implications include a minimal awareness of tourism policy by strategic policy makers in the LA and regional policy makers. Most policy makers in the study, have a very limited appreciation about the wider role of tourism to the economy.

The third characteristic is uncertainty in the context of rapid change in local and regional policy environment and communication breakdown between LA and region. As a result of uncertainty there is inaction in tourism policy making at the local level, duplication of initiatives/conflicting objectives and inadequate communication.

The fourth characteristic is lack of consensus arising around the breakdown in communication around sub regional proposals and ML. As a result of the former, the approach to policy making was reviewed and decision-making powers shifted to the LA’s. It has resulted in a breakdown in communication between YF and the LA’s, leading to infrequent meetings and a lack of trust and uncertainty. The development of ML appears to have been characterised by lack of consensus, poor communication between local officers and inactivity-indecision on the LA’s approach to tourism.
The fifth characteristic is lack of congruence between various initiatives and the policies that impact upon tourism. At the regional level, initiatives have different boundaries (see Appendix 6) and appear to cut across one another and there is uncertainty arising from the conflicting agendas of the various programmes. Policy makers in LCC recognise the tensions between the initiatives and the contradictions arising as they attempt to comply and engage with different programmes. These tensions lead to a situation where local policy makers have a key role in choosing how enthusiastically they will engage in different initiatives. So for example in Leeds there is evidence of more enthusiasm at the local level for the City Region and less for sub-regional delivery structures. Where the policies appear to conflict the LA appear to pursue policy in line with the City Region agenda rather than the sub-regional agenda.

The sixth characteristic is complexity and arises from the fuzzy boundaries of tourism policy, the difficulties in separating it from wider issues and the various networks and actors that connect it into a wide range of other policy areas. The implications of complexity are that key policy makers do not understand what tourism policy is or how it fits. Tourism policy is not being enacted or implemented by LA's partly because they do not need to engage in this activity but also because it is not clear how they should be engaging.

The first three characteristics (low status, lack of clarity and uncertainty) reoccur most frequently across the three sets of interviews in Leeds and Cambridge and across a range of interviewees at local and regional level. These three characteristics appear to be inherent or embedded in tourism policy making and are of major importance in terms of understanding tourism policy making by LCC. The fourth and fifth characteristics (a lack of consensus and lack of congruence) occur in Leeds and are specifically connected with the RDA’s proposals for tourism policy and service delivery and the proposals for ML. In Leeds there are uncertainties arising from the RDA’s taking over the strategic function for tourism. Within LCC there is a lack of consensus about the future place of tourism within the Council, with some interviewees expressing concern that tourism services might become subsumed into the activities of ML and others welcoming such a development.
In Leeds complexity underpins some of the comments but it is identified as something occurring in the wider environment or more generally in public policy making. Few interviewees directly discuss complexity as a specific characteristic of tourism policy making. Further analysis of the case study material in the context of the themes and characteristics in Chapter 8 indicates that tourism policy faces a different set of complexities than other more established local public policy areas. These are connected with its low status, lack of clarity and uncertainty and lead to a set of relatively intangible factors many related to power, and the interactions and relationships that develop between individuals as they engage in their work.

The analysis presented in Chapter 8 emphasises the extent to which these characteristics are bound together and overlapping. The characteristics run through all the main themes and are characterised by their indistinct or 'fuzzy' boundaries. The fuzziness of the boundaries and the interrelationships is a feature of the complexity of tourism policy making. In this study an attempt to separate them would be illogical and whilst it would create something that is neater and more easily defined it would also create something that is artificial and lacks integrity in that it does not reflect the opinions of policy makers.

The contribution of the research to understanding tourism policy

The study conceptualises tourism policy as a social phenomenon and develops theory about tourism policy making by investigating the factors and circumstances affecting LA tourism policy from the perspective of policy makers. It develops a detailed study of tourism policy in Leeds, identifying and evaluating key themes and characteristics of policy making in the context of case study material from Cambridge; historical analysis of Leeds; broader historical analysis of tourism policy making in England and a survey of tourism policy making in England by LA’s. It draws from a broad range of literature, much of which is not discussed in the tourism policy literature. The literature review includes material on complexity theory and public policy making in England, and has been undertaken on the basis that it is relevant to developing a more holistic understanding of tourism policy making in the context of the study.
The study indicates that LA tourism policy in Leeds;

1. takes place in a rapidly changing and dynamic environment;

The combination of modernisation, governance and third way ideology, mean that LA tourism policy takes place in a context that is turbulent and dynamic. In Leeds, tourism policy does not have clear boundaries and is developed and delivered by a number of organisations in partnership. This is supported by wider research by Richards (1991), Stevenson & Lovatt (2001), Thomas & Thomas (1998) and Tyler & Dinan (2001a&b) indicating that the tourism policy arena is complex at local level, with LA's and their varied partners taking a wide variety of approaches to developing tourism policy through a range of plans and strategies with different foci and objectives.

2. takes place on the margins of LAs;

Tourism lies on the margins of LA policy making, and is not explicitly addressed in the wider public policy literature or in policy debates. Its marginality arises from its non statutory nature, a lack of clarity about what it is and how it fits with other more established policy areas, and a lack of interest from the local electorate and local politicians. The study indicates that tourism officers are unlikely to have a powerful voice in wider policy structures and may not have the power to influence wider policy.

3. is intricately connected and cannot be separated from other policy areas;

Stevenson & Lovatt (2001) indicate that it is difficult to make generalisations about LA tourism policy in terms of its nature, organisational setting, approach or funding. In one LA tourism policy may be predominantly focussed on marketing, in another economic development and in a third visitor management. The study illustrates the lack of clarity expressed by local policy makers in Leeds about where tourism fits and how it feeds into
higher level policy making. The marginality of tourism policy in the LA policy process means that in practice it does not clearly link into any of the mainstream policy areas.

4. is essentially about communication;

The wider literature on complexity (by Fonseca, 2002; Mitleton Kelly, 1998; Shaw, 2002; and Stacey, 2003) stresses the extent to which policy making is a "soft" intuitive human process rather than a rational scientific process. The interviewees identify the key role of interactions between people in the policy process, highlighting the extent to which tourism policy is negotiated and open to varied interpretation. The implication of this constant negotiation and interaction is that policy is constantly changing and cannot be "fixed" or clearly defined. The importance of communication and negotiation emphasises the need to develop theory that take account of the experiences and views of those involved in the policy process.

5. is affected by factors that are context specific;

The study illustrates the extent to which tourism policy is dependent on its environment, and key people within that environment. The implication of this is that the development and enactment of policy is likely to be different in different locations. If the tourism policy environment is characterised by its context specificity, then it makes little sense to rely on a theoretical approach which are based upon the notion of universality. This means localised deeper studies are required in order to develop understand of tourism policy.

6. occurs in an environment characterised by paradoxes and contradictions in the policy environment and in the tourism policy process itself;

The study highlights the dynamics of policy making and action in terms of continuing tension and identifies the unpredictable consequences of those dynamics. It uses concepts from complexity science to evaluate these tensions as they arise and as a way of recognising that paradox and contradiction are inherent in the policy process rather than identifying them as problems that need to be resolved. The implication of the acceptance of the fundamental nature of the contradictory tensions identified in the study
is that research needs to be developed in a way that recognises and takes account of paradox and contradiction.

7. is characterised by intangible components which are often more important than the tangible components.

The TSL provides clear and tangible manifestation of tourism policy however by 2005 none of the key policy makers mention this document and it has been largely forgotten. In the opinion of these policy makers tourism policy is intricately connected with other policies, is implicit in many policy documents and cannot be separated from other policy areas. Chapter 8 highlights the importance of the ambiguous and less tangible aspects of policy making or what Darwin (2001) calls ‘backstage activity’ which include the interactions, and the power and politics of policy making. In the view of policy makers the most important developments and the negotiations that affect tourism policy are those that are emerging and are not formalised within policy documents. These include the negotiations around the role and remit of ML, the decision freeze the tourism post and to merge the tourism managers role with the Inward Investment managers role and the lack of consensus and negotiation around the regional proposals.

The findings of this study question the dominance of universal models as a way of understanding tourism policy making and challenge positivist approaches in terms of their linearity and assumptions about causality and association. They identify a process where the relationship between tangible policy and the action of policy makers is blurred and sometimes contradictory as change in the wider environment alters the terrain within which policies are enacted. Tourism policy is the result of communication between many people in a variety of different organisations and the actions of tourism policy makers are negotiated with and constrained by other policy makers. The study draws attention towards the importance of interactions and communications between policy makers as policy is developed and enacted. These interactions reflect turbulence and change in the wider environment and the complex arrangements for the development and enactment of LA policy.
The contribution to tourism research methodology

Tourism policy takes place in an environment that is characterised by interactions between people and is complex, fluid and changeable. These characteristics require a different type of research, focussing on developing understanding of tourism policy making as a complex and multi faceted phenomena and which is characterised by interactions and communications between people. Research needs to be focussed on developing an understanding of the network of connections between people and policies as they change and develop over time.

The conceptualisation of policy as something that emerges from human action, and interaction rather than a set of procedures or techniques, or its physical manifestations, has implications on the design of research strategy. Chapter 5 outlines the conceptual orientation of the research methodology drawing from concepts from complexity and grounded theory to develop a qualitative research strategy for this dissertation. The strategy encompassed many elements from Glasers (1978,1992,1993,1998), grounded theory but did not adhere strictly to his approaches. Ideas advocated by complexity theorists (including Shaw, 2002 and Stacey 2003) about the role of the researcher and the multiplicity of voices of the interviewees, were included in the design of the strategy to add depth, meaning, and reflexivity. The research strategy was designed to take account of the multiple views of local policy makers and the dynamism and complexity within the policy process. It was designed to generate a richness of data to deepen enhance knowledge of tourism policy making from a variety of ground level perspectives. The research strategy was supported by the adoption of a narrative approach for the interviews. This enabled multiple perspectives to be presented and highlighted the importance of relationships and discourse in constructing meaning. The narratives drew attention to the way in which action emerges as a result of interaction between people involved in the process.

The pace of change evident in the study highlights the impossibility of fully understanding the factors that affect tourism policy and the need to develop research in the context of incomplete knowledge. The author developed the study in consideration of material from Goulding (2002), Miller & Twining Ward (2005), Phillimore & Goodson (2002) and Tosey (2002) which encourages approaches which are more adaptive,
experimental, humble and precautionary. The research strategy was designed to consider the information that was presented without trying to reduce and model it. It required the researcher to recognise her own preconceptions, prejudices and limitations and to be courageous in resisting the orthodoxy to reduce and simplify her findings. The strategy was developed in the knowledge that any theory developed as a result of this study would be context specific and although it may have resonance in wider settings it would not be capable of generalisation into the wider world.

The author is aware that several other PhD studies are being developed at present using grounded theory but there is very little discussion in the published literature about practical application of this approach. Grounded theory has not been used in tourism policy studies, but has been used in wider public policy research (including Coyle, 1997; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Glaser 1993, Goulding 2002).

Practical implications of the research

This research supports the idea that the dominant approaches to tourism policy create a false sense of clarity because they define the process in a partial or blinkered way. In focussing on the tangible elements they underplay the less visible, less stable, ambiguous and uncertain elements that have major implications on the policy process. This study is not intended to re-conceptualise tourism policy, but aims contribute to the emerging body of literature which questions the dominance of the universal approaches and linear thinking associated with the positivist paradigm and supports localised, deeper studies to take account of complexity and context (including Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004, Kerr et al, 2001; Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005).

The study indicates that tourism policy is connected to wider changes in the public policy environment. Key policy makers perceive tourism policy in the context of wider initiatives, which suggests that it should not be investigated in isolation from its dynamic wider policy context. The implication for tourism researchers is that tourism policy studies should be developed focus on a much broader conceptualisation of policy. At the local level in England academics and researchers should be investigating tourism policy within its public policy context rather than describing how to produce a written strategy or assessing the changing objectives of tourism policy. There is a need to focus
on an approach that develops understanding from a starting point of recognising the “problem” or the characteristics of tourism policy making.

The study indicates that in Leeds the focus on the development a formal plan using traditional techniques is overstated. The Leeds study demonstrates that it is possible to create a strategy using traditional techniques and approaches but raises questions about the logic of approaching policy making in this way in a context where the TSL is irrelevant to the key policy makers, who have forgotten about it by the interviews in 2005. If the findings of the study have a wider resonance it is possible that the focus of tourism policy literature on the techniques and process of preparing a plan is misguided.

The study shows that the key issue for the LA tourism manager is how to negotiate with other policy makers to ensure that tourism issues are considered on the mainstream policy agenda. This raises questions about whether tourism research and education should be focussed on developing a much broader understanding of the local public policy and political process so that tourism managers are equipped to influence people within the LA environment. The implication for educators is that tourism policy studies should support a broader conceptualisation of tourism policy and develop knowledge and skills to enable more effective negotiation in a rugged and turbulent policy environment, rather than the specific techniques and approaches associated with producing a plan. Whilst some technical knowledge may be required the Leeds study indicates that it is far more important for tourism managers to learn how to work collaboratively and to influence powerful people.

Limitations of research

The research limitations arise from the constraints of the PhD. The study was undertaken by a single researcher and was time constrained which led to the decision initially to develop two case studies and then during the process to focus on just one study area. Whilst considerable care was taken in choosing the case study areas, with the participating LAs volunteering for the study to be developed in their areas, in practice it was very difficult to persuade key policy makers in Cambridge to be interviewed. This coupled with the lack of activity around tourism policy development led to the decision
not to carry out second stage interviews. The first stage interviews provided useful comparative material and were used in the evaluation chapter.

The decision to undertake one in depth case study means that it might be argued that the findings apply to Leeds only and do not have resonance in other contexts. However the regional interviewees in the narratives indicate that many of the issues faced by tourism policy makers in Leeds are faced by other LAs in the region. The literature review, historical analysis, and Cambridge study are drawn together in the evaluation chapter to show that although the themes and characteristics are specific to Leeds that they have a resonance in the wider LA context.

Another limitation is that the primary research for this study was developed over two years and presents a “snapshot in time” Pearce 2001:649. The decision to develop the study over two years represents an attempt to give a sense of the dynamism of change. The historical analysis in Chapters 4 and 6 are also intended to widen the time frame and to provide a sense of change and development over the past 27 years.

Recommendations for future research

The study supports the development of further research into the characteristics of the tourism policy process, taking into account the turbulence and complexity of its environment. This study indicates that tourism policy research should be developed from a broader perspective taking account the wider literature on politics and public policy, the discussions of complexity theory by social scientists. More research need to be undertaken to focus on what tourism policy is, and what happens when tourism managers try to develop and enact policies in different policy environments.

This study supports the development of local, case based research to improve the understanding of tourism policy making in its specific context and to develop understanding and theory development from the bottom up. It also supports research into policy from the perspective of practitioners to broaden understanding of policy as a social process involving collaboration and negotiation.
The study is an ongoing research project and in the near future the author will return to Leeds to undertake a third year of interviews. Subject to funding and the findings of the next stage of interviews she intends to revisit the policy makers in order to develop a longitudinal study. In 2005 several interviewees indicated that the uncertainty about the future of tourism policy may be temporary and that in 12-18 months times there would be more clarity about the arrangements. It was clear during the last stages of the research that the regional policy framework has developed and changed rapidly since the last study visit. Also the leadership of the Alliance has changed since 2005 and it appears that the local policy context is changing rapidly. In the next visit she will investigate whether the pace of change has intensified or reduced in Leeds since 2005, whether the arrangements for tourism have more clarity and the implications of Marketing Leeds on the development and delivery of tourism policy. In medium term the author intends to extend this study into another case study area to investigate the key issues in that area and perhaps to investigate the extent to which the findings in Leeds have a relevance and resonance in other local areas.
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I qualified as a town planner in the mid 1980's and spent over 10 years working in the public sector to develop and implement land use plans. The majority of this experience was in U.K. local authorities, during a very turbulent period in terms of organisational change, political change and the emergence of a plethora of new initiatives, approaches, and techniques to land use policy making. This experience partly explains my interest in the local level, and the practice of policy making, and the influence of context. I think that my local government experience has led to empathy and honesty from many respondents.

I am currently employed as a tourism lecturer with a specialism in policy and planning and have taught and researched policy and planning to students from a variety of backgrounds including land use planning, urban regeneration, housing, business and tourism. My research into tourism policy planning in 2000 enabled me to make good contacts with those people involved in the policy process. On the negative side I am aware that my experience as a lecturer and researcher has made several interviewees slightly nervous about their understanding and approaches.

My research is being conducted on a part time basis over a long time frame (5-6 years) and in conjunction with a full time job and family. This has had implications of the method of writing up case studies and my ability to immerse myself in the data. As a consequence the methods I have chosen for collecting and analysing data have involved me manually processing data so that I can remain close to the data. For example I chose to tape and transcribe interviews and used memo's to chart my thinking them. This enabled me to become really familiar with data and to keep records of data and of my thoughts as they emerged.
APPENDIX 2: THE RESEARCH PROCESS - A SUMMARY

Background
LA survey and analysis 2000-1
Preliminary Literature Review
Methodological Evaluation/Selection of Grounded Theory to underpin research

Field Research 1 in Leeds 04
1a) Exploratory/unstructured interview with Tourism Manager TM in Leeds
Observations/perceptions of key issues and people
Analysis of transcript to develop semi-structured interviews
1b) Interviews with key people identified by TM
Semi structured interviews themed on basis of issues identified by TM
Perceptions of key people and issues collected
Simultaneous data collection and analysis
Transcription of data
Fragmentation of data through open coding
Memo's written
Constant comparison

Field Research 2 in Cambridge 04
2a) Semi structured interviews with Tourism Manager TM and Policy Planner PP in Cambridge
Observations/perceptions of key issues and people
2b) Interviews with key people identified by TM and PP
Semi structured interviews themed on basis of issues identified by TM and PP
Perceptions of key people and issues collected
Simultaneous data collection and analysis
Transcription of data
Fragmentation of data through open coding
Memo's written
Constant comparison
Further Analysis
Review text segments for both sets of interviews
Memo's written
Constant Comparison
Conceptual Categorisation – identifying concepts and their properties
Axial Coding
Development of conceptual categories

Field Research 3 Revisit Leeds to develop field research 05
Semi structured interviews – subjects selected on the basis of theoretical sampling
Perceptions of key issues and people (changes over the year)
Discussion of conceptual categories emerging from phase 1 (Themes)
Further concept development (Characteristics)
Concept checking
Reflection and refinement

Analysis and Writing up
Literature Review
Themes and characteristics developed further and written up in two narratives
Themes and characteristics contextualised using wider literature and historical analysis
Further evaluation to present core categories and theories (first draft chapter 8)
Review and Evaluate
Write Up
APPENDIX 3: FULL TRANSCRIPTION OF AN INTERVIEW

Interview with L1 on 20/5/04

L1: My job is ***** and *****that relates obviously into tourism

Me: In terms of image - what do you think are the key issues in tourism from your perspective?

L1: From my perspective erm it is a much wider issue than tourism - from my perspective there are other things that we've being debating for sort of 4 or 5 years - there is an issue about Leeds not doing sufficient to promote and market its image - whether it be with in the tourism sector or in the inward investment sector or whether it be within the student sector to attract student to Leeds. And therefore we have not been be "punching our weight" in getting the message across to come to Leeds. And I think it has become more apparent when you look at the Manchester's of this world and the Birmingham's of this world about the extent of marketing and communication work that they have been doing particularly at the national and international level and making a direct link between the success of communications marketing to how it influences investment decisions - so investment decisions whether it be in terms of a tourist, or a business or by a student who wants to study within the City. So I came to a conclusion – or a number of people did as - part of the progressing what we call the Vision for Leeds which is a sort of strategy for the next 16 years of where we want to be– a key strand of that has been identified about the profile is about becoming a true European city and all those things. So that sort of came to a – so that came to OK so we think we've go a issue – we are not doing enough - but what s the answer- erm - we have within the Authority resources which are targeted at say tourism – so L6 and her team – a relatively small team but they do the whole gambit of sort of product development, tourism policy, strategy and marketing, the offer of short conference desk facilities the Tourist Information Centre and all of that – but a relatively small team overall with a relatively small budget overall - although large probably in comparison to our neighbouring authorities – with even smaller tourism functions. Separately to that our inward investment team who are trying to attract businesses to relocate or business to evolve
and develop within the city - separately to that a City Centre Team who are marketing the vitality and the offer of the City Centre from a retail and a nightlife sort of perspective and maybe even separately to that the Leeds Initiative trying to promote and market the city in its wider sense. So little pockets of work being done to market and promote Leeds but they tend to give different messages – So no coordination in terms of what the key messages are that we are seeking to portray or what the marking approach ought to be – from the consistency perspective and that is where we need good organisation.

When you step back as we did and say OK we accept we are not doing enough what do we need to do and other partners say the Council needs to do more and spend more - you say well - it is not as easy as that - do we need to do we say well its not as easy as that I mean the council has got a limited budget I mean education social services emptying the bins and cleaning the streets – most of the money goes into that. To say we will take a million pounds out of those services to put into, say tourism or marketing - it is not an easy decision to take the reality you will never ever get the politicians to do that. The only cities where you can do that is when the city is really heavily dependent on tourism like Blackpool lets say for example. Where there will be a different ethos and thinking behind it. So I started to explore with those partners where actually everyone in the city needs to see this as a collective approach. It is not just what the Council do– i.e. what are the Universities doing to market the – city in order to attract students? What are the major hospitals doing? I mean we have the biggest teaching hospital in Europe. Obviously there will be a staffing issue there in terms of attracting staff. I mean what are they doing to market the city to get the skills that they require? What’s the chamber of commerce doing? And I think it became apparent quite early on is that if we actually somehow start to bring these things together in a coordinated way and a coordinated strategy we could do much more. You could then take it to the next level, which is O.K. who benefits from increased tourism and increased investment? Well it is individual businesses within the City. It’s the individual retailers, the individual nightclub owners and the restaurant owners – and how can we get those involved. And we started to firm up in our minds of a strategy then we could take something forward which everyone in the city could sign up to and help to deliver both in offering in time and resources- That was the idea of the principle and that is really where my linking in and relationship between L6 and the tourism team has sort of developed from there.
Me: So how recently have you been trying to pull together all the marketing initiatives – how recently has that happened?

L1: What we’ve found is that we’ve accepted that was an issue in principle but also accepted well how do you get a weight of…. How do you get an argument pulled together - an evidenced argument – which persuades people that there really is an issue. Because one of the things that is often said is – Well you are saying all this – about competing with Manchester but for the last 15 years we have been the fastest growing city in the UK – A city that has more job growth than any other City within the UK. Without, despite (not) having a coordinated marketing endeavour. Why is it an issue? So we are getting those sort of questions when you start to ask people to put their money on the table or to make a big commitment. So one of the things we did last year we undertook a fairly detailed piece of perception research work through Brahm – I don’t know whether L6 mentioned it to you?

Me: L2 mentioned it

L1: L2 mentioned it - That was £80,000 it cost us so it was a lot of money and it was probably one of the biggest pieces of research work that we’ve done for a number of years. And Brahm on our behalf assessed perceptions locally, nationally and internationally against all different audiences so residents, business, students – erm. And what they found – they did qualitative and quantitative essentially - What they found was locally if you lived in Leeds you thought Leeds was wonderful i.e. they thought Leeds was a great city to live, great nightlife, lots going on etc etc and the figures were so good that every – So the questions like do you think Leeds has a great quality of live – 90% said yes, and the figures were all 85% plus and we were surprised by that because we expected them to be high but not that high. When you actually look at the national or international perspective it was the opposite – it was – Which cities do you consider to be great places to live and Leeds came somewhere need the bottom – places like Liverpool, Belfast, Newcastle, Sheffield even, above us. Asking business directors in Europe which cities do you consider to be major UK business centres - Leeds scored better but still was way behind Manchester and still way behind Birmingham in the perception of the people – Ask people nationally or internally what do you associate with Leeds. Or if I say Leeds to you what do you think and something like
43 respondents said Leeds United and next largest group – I think it was 24 percent said I don’t know I can’t think of anything when you say Leeds I don’t know – I don’t know where it is I don’t know what it has got to offer.

And so what we have found is that the local, wonderful – like the product – love the city once you got here you did not want to leave - but if you are national or international and generally speaking had not experienced Leeds then generally you did not have a view. Now in a way that is not necessarily negative because people weren’t offering negative views about Leeds. So they weren’t doing what they were did in the early 1980’s about Glasgow they weren’t saying Glasgow awful industrial city where if you go in you are going to get mugged or going to get shot they weren’t saying that. They were saying I don’t have any knowledge, so no I am not taking a decision to visit or to invest there because I don’t know.

So using that research which was quite stark, in terms of the message, and particularly at a time when you are talking to the universities about how they need to attract international students. You are talking to the business sector about how they need to attract international business and they are saying well actually yeah they don’t know about us do they. We think we are wonderful but out there no-body knows and an appreciation that actually we do need to work together, collectively, to respond to that.

That research was probably - whilst it was expensive- it was probably absolute value for money in terms of how it helped us to persuade people to think differently. And what it has developed onto is the establishment of a task group, which is erm a citywide task group with all the key partners on who – start to think about strategy. We have adopted “Leeds the UK’s favourite City” just as a message - a “strap line” and it is just something that people within the City can sign up to and acknowledge and we’ve got a fact base behind it. Whether we can live up to it in the long term, who knows, at the moment we don’t particularly care because we can do that longer term marketing strategy as we move forward.

The other thing probably it would be worth mentioning is a debate that has come up and happened – It came up in the Brahm research work to an extent and also in some other work that Yorkshire Forward are doing and it is about– where is Leeds within the
Country with it being in Yorkshire. Yorkshire has a brand so if you go and ask about Leeds people say I don’t know but if you say Leeds in Yorkshire – people say oh yeah Yorkshire – but what perception do people then have about Yorkshire - cos how have they interfaced or come across Yorkshire because no doubt it will be visiting some of the coastal towns or it will be a holiday as tourists in the moors or it will be what you see on tele. in terms of Emmerdale or any other of the series. And the suggestion that – actually that can work quite negatively against of what the offer of Leeds is in terms of being an urban tourism offer that the Yorkshire Brand can actually work against it. That people assume the Yorkshire Brand is actually the same as the Leeds Brand. So we recognise that as an issue and that has become more apparent in the last 12 months Yorkshire Forward has actually taken responsibility for the Yorkshire Tourist Board and erm the Yorkshire Tourist Board had previously been responsible directly to the DCMS. Yorkshire Forward , being new decided to take or get consultants to undertake a review of the Yorkshire Tourist Board and its role and they have made a number of proposals. They have agreed that is probably too big in terms of the overall board to be a truly effective membership and product development body because the product does vary across the region— the tourism product. And therefore they are proposing to change the role and format YTB and set up sub regional bodies and so their initial proposal was that for each of the sub regions in Yorkshire and Humberside –so West Yorkshire, is a sub region - it would have what they call a Destination Management organisation (DMO) which we struggled with – with the concept - in terms of what responsibilities would that body have and I must admit it was a lack of detail it was hard to get beneath it. But assuming it would be around product development within that particular sub area it should be around marketing the brand around that particular sub area. It would be about having a membership scheme for key businesses, hoteliers etc- members of that tourist organisation. We struggled with the concept of it being a sub region i.e. what is West Yorkshire as a brand well actually it is nothing. It is a county - its something to us because we live in the county but from an entity perspective well actually it is just 3 districts are very urbanised in terms of Wakefield Bradford and Leeds in very close proximity but when you get to Huddersfield and you get to Halifax – very different in terms of the product. And also when you actually look at Leeds our offer really in terms of brand really does extend into Selby and York in North Yorkshire. So we are really questioning the validity of doing something on a sub regional basis and I don’t know where that will end up, but at the same time what we are doing is we are setting up
something in Leeds called Marketing Leeds – with a focus on promoting and marketing the city – It is going to start initially small but were going to consider over the next 12-18 months how that might evolve –to pick up maybe tourism issues, to pick up maybe inward investment, marketing and issues of that nature.

Me: Just to clarify. It's a company is it?

L1: Yes.

Me: And its been set up with who? Who are the owners?

L1: The two owners, the two shareholders effectively, being Leeds City Council and the Chamber of Commerce so private/public sector is the intention and the funding of it, cos that is the key question actually, cos at the end of the day a lot of this is about how you get funding in to develop the products that we want and to do the maximum communication is going to come from hopefully Yorkshire Forward we are putting in a bid of just short of £900,000 over the next 5 years and that will be supplemented by a “membership champion scheme" where we get people within the city to become “champions". They pay an amount of money to become a "champion" for us. That helps us to then get some resource to develop the company, what it is doing and do the marketing they get some benefits from that as well. I think that is a quick run through of some of the issues that we are considering.

Me: Has the Council restructuring impacted upon the work that you are doing?

L1: It has provided more clarity to be honest because 12 months ago – more than 12 months ago before last April when we had tourism within leisure services, we had inward investment within the Leeds Development Agency and we had City Centre Management on its own and the Leeds Initiative on its own.

What we've now got is City Centre Management, tourism and inward investment all under one manager within the Development Department. So I have got one contact I can work with closely bringing those things together and the Leeds Initiative is effectively within my department so we can work much more close together and try to get a
strategy around this which is much more aligned that we could have previously – so there are major benefits.

Me: And you have really noticed that in the last year?

L1: We introduced it last April. But to be honest – tourism actually – we didn’t take the decision about transferring tourism until about last July/August. So it has only been the last 6 months but yeah there has been a noticeable difference and I would say that there has been a noticeable difference and I would say that the relationship between ourselves and the tourism team has been much better – since that change.

Me: Has it affected the things that drive or shape tourism policy? Will it change the focus or is it just bringing tourism policy into the mainstream/wider policy area?

L1: I think erm – well I am pretty sure that tourism policy will develop and change in the next few years purely because the way the world is changing and the way that cities are viewed in terms of – sort of the offer that cities have on which you can build tourism policy around. I think that what we have found within Leeds is that if you go back 15 years an extremely parochial city with a lot of indigenous businesses within the city and what we have found in the last few years, a lot of big firms have either moved to Leeds or they have consolidated their headquarters and closed down their other offices. So the number of value added jobs within the area have increased quite significantly and our projections for the next 10 years see similar increases.

What we are finding is with the addition of people in higher value jobs with more money to spend is that they want to spend it within the City, they want the cultural infrastructure they want the “offer” within the city to spend that money – now quite plainly if you can build that offer for those people who are working in the City, it becomes an offer for the tourism market as well and I think we are starting to do that. But for Leeds there are some big gaps in our cultural infrastructure in terms of lacking a concert hall of significance, lacking an arena of significance, lacking an exhibition centre or a conference centre of significance. Now we won’t achieve all of those in the next 4, 5 or 6 years. We might achieve one of those, and the biggest debate is actually which one, which one do we consider to be a priority for the City. And there will then be a debate in
doing that about which one will be the mainstream or a big part of our tourism policy in looking forward. I went up to Glasgow last year to do some research with the Chief executive – you’ll have to meet him sometime because he is a bit of a character. But Glasgow when they built their conference centre which is a very effective looking building – quite incredible- well that changed the whole focus of their tourism perspective of business tourism – because as soon as they started aiming at the conference market what they found was that by using their teaching hospital it essentially became a medical conference centre – where all of the surgeons and doctors had been going around the world but started coming to Glasgow and that has been quite significant in terms of the additional visits, business visits albeit to Glasgow and impact of the economy the growth of the hotel sector etc

Me: It seems that the conference market here is quite vibrant almost despite the lack of a centre?

L1: It is. Yes.

Me: The attractions and the hotels have provided facilities for the market?

L1: We do get a lot within the hotels and smaller venues but we don’t get the he bigger events. The growth of hotels is massive, the number of hotel beds, I think it has gone up, I don’t know the figures but lets say 1,000- 4,000 in a matter of 3 or 4 years. And it’s the same with housing, housing within the City Centre in terms of people living within the City Centre so again I think we’ve got 8,000 dwellings now within the core of the City Centre. That is projected to be 17,000 in another 5-6 years. And what we are finding is that because of the success of the city and businesses that are moving here, people are coming to Leeds to work but some of them for a relatively short time, so that they are coming from America for 2years before they move on to their next career, the next rung on the ladder. And they just they are using the hotels or the City Centre accommodation. They’ve not got their families her and therefore they are wanting to spend their money and want the cultural offer of Leeds city
Me: Your function appears to be quite centrally focussed. Are their any issues about marketing and tourism efforts being directed at the City Centre with the wider electorate – Does this present you with any difficulties in gaining support of the councillors?

L1: Yes and it is not just around tourism it is around a lot of policies that we take forward which seek to develop the City Centre and the core of the City – We spent a lot of money on pedestrianising the City Centre 10 years ago and the amount of political uproar there was about that cos we were spending those millions there but half a mile up the road you’ve got thousands of people living in poverty. One of the most deprived communities within the UK then you’ve got a real dilemma. And yes we do get it. I think there is a broader acceptance that a City like Leeds needs to have a successful core needs to have a City Centre which is prosperous, which is vibrant which is distinctive, which has an offer – Its like the Millennium Square debate - people criticised us all for spending £11 million, albeit £6 million came from the Millennium commission. £11 million on the Millennium Square, but what that has created around it in terms of a) private sector investment in terms of the development but also in terms of the use of the Square for community use. People are starting to come on board ... but it will always be a dilemma - and as much for the opposition politicians who want to use it for the sake of using it as it is for the Labour Politicians who are out there and are more concerned about the ward issues. And actually the reality is that some people within Leeds who don’t even get out of their wards- don’t come to the City Centre because they don’t see it as their City Centre.

The other related issue to that is that as Leeds District we also include sort of 4 or 5 Boroughs, which in the past have been independent. So Morley used to be a borough in its own right, Otley did, Weatherby did. And what you find there is that at one level – there is a view that we are not part of Leeds - we’re Otley we’re not Leeds. Leeds is over there we don’t want to be part of Leeds – it tends to be the older residents and they are quite vociferous i.e. we put a lot of boundary signs up about 4 or 5 years ago “Welcome to Leeds”, well there was absolute uproar in Otley and Weatherby. This is not Leeds we are Otley, we are Weatherby – and we had to put another sign up – “Welcome to Leeds-you are now in Weatherby” kind of thing – just to deal with that. But what we are finding with the research we are doing in terms of the younger people within those areas the but also younger people in say Wakefield or say Bradford or the edges, they say they from
Leeds and they are proud to be from Leeds because they see how the City has grown and the profile of the City is much better now than it was 20 years ago.

Me: Are there any other barriers to formulating or developing marketing or tourism policies in Leeds?

L1: Well we've talked about funding, we've talked about people needing to have a collective view and a collective endeavour and a coordinated marketing strategy erm talked about members - erm- They are the three major ones I can't think of anything of similar significance. Its fair to say, we've talked about members but actually there are people out their in the community particularly the voluntary sector who are less concerned about the City Centre and are more concerned about their individual client base and that can be a barrier sometimes particularly concerning partnership don't understand that if you put monies into – and sometimes miss the argument that the prosperity of the city O.K. whilst it creates a lot of high value jobs and a lot of people from elsewhere in the UK come to get those – they don't often go to Leeds residents. They also in terms of the support industries and service industries that support them and create jobs that are lower down and that is why we have got one of the lowest unemployment rates in...

Me: Are there any bits of the Council that haven't quite embraced partnership?

L1: Erm I think it is fair to say that – OK everything is not rosy – where even with the type of areas I've got from a marketing perspective I can sometimes feel maybe that they've not engaged as they should or sometimes need a lot of persuading to be engaged. I think in a way it is inevitable in terms of people identifying with their own work, their own people their own ideas and if you are trying to tweak that with a more corporate approach it is sometimes difficult and it is the way that you do it. So there is still some work to do there. If I said that the main challenges for me from a corporate perspective particularly tourism – i.e. social services is a big issue in terms that it very much concentrates on social issues and social care – and maybe hasn't been as corporate as it could or should have been – but again its that culture its about how its led and the director has just left i.e. retired at the end of march and now I can start to see that their will be a different culture in the department where they are more open to
working with others to respond to some of the issues. But when you are talking about
the organisation like Leeds which has got 34,000 staff across 7 departments and some
of those departments are very big like social services has got 6,000 staff erm it is very
difficult to get that culture coming through – So their will still be pockets there will still be
people out their in the sticks doing care work or doing neighbourhood warden work who
aren't integrated with the other services and don't recognise they have a wider
community role across a whole range of services. So it's a big challenge.

Me: What about within the City Centre and within development services?

L1: That should be a lot better because before the restructure there used to be all sorts
of issues because City Centre Management used to be a small team at the corporate
centre. Trying to get highways to sort out the pavements and the road infrastructure.
Getting cleansing to make sure that they did cleansing at appropriate times for retailers
and so they were not disturbing residents cos we've increased the numbers living in the
City Centre. And I think sometimes dialogue is sometimes strained because their focus
is different i.e. ones job is to clean the litter up actually no its not it is more about the
liveability of the City Centre and your role within that it is not just pick the litter up. And
now they are one department those things are coming together. And sometimes it is just
an issue around well we want you to do that but it is going to cost this. We haven't got
the money to do that and we will have to do that. At least if you are in one department
you've got one director then you can get a clear view then about whether they can find
the money. Previously there were 2 directors and they were both saying we can't find
the money so it never happens.

Me: Who are the key actors in the policy process?

L1: (answers not included to protect the identity of interviewees)
And Yorkshire Forward increasingly because they get a better grasp of all this and I think
they are still grappling with that. They will have to be more influential as they are going
to be the fund holder they are going to be the client body for the Yorkshire tourism. So
they are they are the main ones
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APPENDIX 4: EXAMPLE OF A MEMO

This memo outlines my reflections on the Interview with L1 after the first attempt at coding (Typed on 12/7/04)

Key Issues:

1. Issue much wider than tourism – it is about promotion of city and city image
   a. Pivotal - Importance of Brahm report. Perceptions of the city - new emphasis on Marketing

2. Low status of tourism –
   a. Very small team with small budget and wide remit – product development, policy, marketing, services, and conference desk facilities.
   b. Competing with other service areas for money – limited support by politicians.

3. Lack of coordination –
   a. Different messages from different parts of Council and need for coordination. But some success without coordination.
   b. Restructuring at local level has provided more clarity (potentially more coordination) - tourism not moved until later

4. Problems with sub regional structure proposed by Yorkshire Forward – concerns with the West Yorkshire Brand- questions validity of sub regional structure

5. Policy will change – world is changing

6. Tourism’s links with culture – and cultural infrastructure needed to “go up a league”

7. Need for a concert hall or arena, or exhibition centre or conference centre – Debate about which one

8. Political dilemma – spending in centre vs. spending in really deprived wards.
APPENDIX 5: EXAMPLE OF CODING AND CODED TEXT SEGMENT

Coding-Version 3 adapted between March – May 2005

This coding has been designed to operate across the two case studies and reflects the nature of the material in the data and a first attempt to cluster some of the emergent themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Tourism Strategy and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP2</td>
<td>Tourism Service Plan/ Marketing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>Politics and Tourism Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Tourism Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>Tourism Issues (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI1</td>
<td>Tourism issues – (negative impacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI2</td>
<td>Tourism issues – (positive impacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI13</td>
<td>Tourism Issues – responses (outside policy framework identified above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP</td>
<td>Wider Council Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP1a</td>
<td>Status in relation to other council policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP1b</td>
<td>Other comments about relationship with wider council policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP2</td>
<td>Status – politics, politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP3</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP4</td>
<td>Public Perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP5</td>
<td>Changes in the wider policy environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0</td>
<td>Council organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO1</td>
<td>Communication within the local authority (between service areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO2</td>
<td>Communication between the LA and other local organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO3</td>
<td>Communication between LA and Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO4</td>
<td>Communication between LA and national government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO5</td>
<td>Communication between tourism officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Research Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Research in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>National Tourism Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Regional Tourism Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Regional Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Wider National Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Wider Regional Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Key people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coded text from interview with L1 Coding on first coded on 2/7 recoded on 3/11 and March 05 on the basis of emerging codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Coded Text Segment</th>
<th>Summarised meanings and interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WCP1b</td>
<td>From my perspective erm it is a much wider issue than tourism</td>
<td>Tourism policy needs to be seen in wider context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP1b, TP</td>
<td>There is an issue about Leeds not doing sufficient to promote and market its image - whether it be with in the tourism sector or in the inward investment sector or whether it be within the student sector to attract student to Leeds.</td>
<td>Context is defined from marketing image perspective problem with image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP 1b</td>
<td>... we have not been &quot;punching our weight&quot; in getting the message across to come to Leeds.</td>
<td>performance in terms of marketing and image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP1b</td>
<td>It has become more apparent when you look at (competitors Manchester Birmingham) about the extent of marketing and communication work that they have been doing particularly at the national and international level and making a direct link between the success of communications marketing to how it influences investment decisions .....in terms of a tourist, or a business or by a student who wants to study within the City</td>
<td>Looks outside region to competitors and compares what they are doing. Perceives investment in broad terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP1b</td>
<td>the Vision for Leeds- a key strand of that that has been identified about the profile is about becoming a true European city</td>
<td>Wider objective to become a European city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>(Tourism Resources)-- so L6 and her team do the whole gambit of product development, tourism policy, strategy and marketing, the offer of short conference desk facilities the Tourist Information Centre and all of that –</td>
<td>Range of services provided by tourism team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI3,</td>
<td>but a relatively small team overall with a relatively limitation of budget, but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP3</td>
<td>small budget overall - although large probably in comparison to our neighbouring authorities – with even smaller tourism functions</td>
<td>compares favourably with competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO, WCP, CCO1</td>
<td>Separately to that our inward investment team who are trying to attract businesses to relocate or evolve and develop within the city - separately to that a City Centre Team who are marketing the vitality and the offer of the City Centre from a retail and a nightlife perspective and maybe even separately to that the Leeds Initiative trying to promote and market the city in its wider sense.</td>
<td>The use of separately is key here. Outlines wider council initiatives but tourism does not appear to be integrated into these initiatives. This is developed in the next few sections. Issues about structures and coordination and integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWCP &amp; C</td>
<td>So little pockets of work being done to market and promote Leeds but they tend to give different messages- So no coordination in terms of what the key messages are that we are seeking to portray or what the marking approach ought to be – from the consistency perspective and that is where we need good organisation.</td>
<td>Poor coordination and different messages given by different parts of the Council. Need for improvements in consistency and integration across the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP 1a 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>other partners say the Council needs to do more and spend more - its not as easy as that. The council has got a limited budget.... education social services emptying the bins and cleaning the streets – most of the money goes into that. .....To say we will take a million pounds out of those services to put into, say tourism or marketing, it is not an easy decision to take. In reality you will never, ever get the politicians to do that.</td>
<td>Competition with other policy/service areas. All other services listed are statutory. Low status in relation to other statutory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO1, 2</td>
<td>Everyone in the city needs to see this as a</td>
<td>Need for coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collective approach. It is not just what the Council do— i.e. what are the Universities doing to market the City in order to attract students? What are the major hospitals doing? ..... What’s the Chamber of Commerce doing?</td>
<td>between different sectors at local level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO1,2</td>
<td>....if we somehow start to bring these things together in a coordinated way and a coordinated strategy we could do much more. O.K. who benefits from increased tourism and increased investment? Well it is individual businesses within the City. .....and how can we get those involved.</td>
<td>coordination could lead to more extensive and effective action. Benefits of tourism go to business – benefits to council and community more indirect. Need to get businesses more involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP</td>
<td>We started to firm up in our minds of a strategy ....which everyone in the city could sign up to and help to deliver both in offering, time and resources-</td>
<td>Wide range of actors involved in developing and delivering wider vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP1b, CCO1</td>
<td>That was the idea of the principle and that is really where my linking in and relationship between L6 and the tourism team has sort of developed from there.</td>
<td>Points to relatively recent collaboration between tourism and marketing officers on policy development and delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCP (But also applies to TP)</td>
<td>How do you get an argument pulled together—which persuades people that there really is an issue. For the last 15 years we have been the fastest growing city in the UK. without having a coordinated marketing endeavour</td>
<td>Need for evidence before people will commit to strategy. Problem of strong performance without coordinated strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging themes and my reflections on the interview with L1 after the third attempt at coding (4/05)

**WCP Wider Council Policy**
- Issue much wider than tourism – it is about promotion of city and city image
  a. Pivotal - Importance of Brahm report. Perceptions of the city - new emphasis on Marketing
  b. Some success in attracting new businesses etc without coordination

Wider objective to become a European city

"I think there is a broader acceptance that a City like Leeds needs to have a successful core, a City Centre which is prosperous, which is vibrant which is distinctive, which has an offer".

Partnership initiatives.

“We are setting up something in Leeds called Marketing Leeds – with a focus on promoting and marketing the city. The two shareholders effectively, being Leeds City Council and the Chamber of Commerce so private/public sector.”

Highlights the importance of developing a single coordinated approach outlining a variety of marketing initiatives from the inward investment team, the City Centre and the Leeds Initiative. Does not mention any marketing initiatives undertaken under the auspices of "tourism"

"We have adopted "Leeds the UK’s favourite City" just as a message -a "strap line"

**WCP1a Status of tourism policy in relation to other council policy**
When talking about the plethora of marketing initiatives currently existing tourism within the council and the Leeds initiative tourism marketing is not mentioned. This perhaps indicates the low status or spend on any specific tourism initiatives. Tourism marketing objectives are subsumed into (or just a minor part of) wider marketing initiatives.

Identifies the competition with other statutory policy/service areas.

"The council has got a limited budget…. education social services emptying the bins and cleaning the streets – most of the money goes into that."
Highlights the relatively low status in relation of non statutory services such as tourism and marketing

"......To say we will take a million pounds out of those services to put into, say tourism or marketing, it is not an easy decision to take. In reality you will never, ever get the politicians to do that."

**WCP 1b, Relationship between wider policy and tourism**

Tourism policy needs to be seen in wider context.

"From my perspective it is a much wider issue than tourism"

Points towards a widening out and integration of tourism policy

"I am pretty sure that tourism policy will develop and change in the next few years purely because the way the world is changing and the way that cities are viewed in terms of – sort of the offer that cities have on which you can build tourism policy around."

Context is defined from marketing image perspective and problems are identified with image.

"There is an issue about Leeds not doing sufficient to promote and market its image - whether it be with in the tourism sector or in the inward investment sector or whether it be within the student sector to attract student to Leeds. ... we have not been be “punching our weight” in getting the message across to come to Leeds."

"It has become more apparent when you look at (competitors Manchester Birmingham) about the extent of marketing and communication work that they have been doing particularly at the national and international level and making a direct link between the success of communications marketing to how it influences investment decisions .....in terms of a tourist, or a business or by a student who wants to study within the City the Vision for Leeds- a key strand of that that has been identified about the profile is about becoming a true European city."

Looks outside region to competitors and compares what they are doing. Perceives investment in broad terms

Tourism's links with culture – and cultural infrastructure needed to “go up a league”

Cultural policy in terms of development of facilities policy being led by changes in workforce/resident profile – new offer has implications on tourism but this is seen as a positive "spin-off" of policy rather than a central element of it.
Developments in cultural infrastructure will change the tourism offer. Outlines the choices in respect of new infrastructure. Does not identify what is behind the debate but the section above would indicate that business interests/concerns would dominate. (refers to)

"the addition of people in higher value jobs with more money to spend, they want the cultural infrastructure....if you can build that offer for those people who are working in the City, it becomes an offer for the tourism market as well and I think we are starting to do that.

Identifies big gaps in our cultural infrastructure in terms of lacking....a concert hall, an arena, an exhibition centre or a conference centre of significance.

"We might achieve one of those, and the biggest debate is actually which one, which one do we consider to be a priority for the City."

**WCP2 Status Politics Politicians**
Competing with other service areas for money

1. limited support by politicians and public.
2. Political dilemma – spending in centre vs. spending in really deprived wards.

Broad support from councillors for tourism but continuing dilemmas about ward issues vs. city issues.

"...but it will always be a dilemma - and as much for the opposition politicians who want to use it as it is for the Labour Politicians who are out there and are more concerned about the ward issues."

Highlights the relatively low status in relation of non statutory services such as tourism and marketing

".....To say we will take a million pounds out of those services to put into, say tourism or marketing, it is not an easy decision to take. In reality you will never, ever get the politicians to do that."

**WCP3 Budget**

"but a relatively small team overall with a relatively small budget overall - although large probably in comparison to our neighbouring authorities – with even smaller tourism functions."

**WCP4 Public Perceptions**

"Brahm - assessed perceptions locally, nationally and internationally against all different audiences.... What they found was if you lived in Leeds you thought
Leeds was wonderful. When you actually look at the national or international perspective it was the opposite - Leeds came somewhere need the bottom. If you are national or international and generally speaking had not experienced Leeds then generally you did not have a view...... They were saying I don't have any knowledge, so no I am not taking a decision to visit or to invest there because I don’t know."

The sharp contrast between local and national, international perceptions is interesting. The research is not specific to tourism but is likely to shape wider policy and the context within which tourism policy is made and service delivered in the future.

"We think we are wonderful but out there no-body knows.... need to work together, collectively, to respond to that."

Brahm report – perceptions research has implications on the Councils approach to marketing the City. There has been pressure for a coordinated response. Also entered in CCO1 and CCO2.

Issues about public perceptions about City Centre policy and the tensions that creates "people out there in the community particularly the voluntary sector are less concerned about the City Centre and are more concerned about their individual client base"

Outlines some of the public criticism of the large high profile projects in the City Centre. "Its like the Millennium Square debate - people criticised us all for spending £11 million, albeit £6 million came from the Millennium commission. £11 million on the Millennium Square, but what that has created around it in terms of private sector investment, in terms of the development but also in terms of the use of the Square for community use."

Also outlines issues surrounding the size of the authority and the existence of separate centres in outlying areas. Older voters in outlying areas do not perceive themselves as a part of Leeds.

"...there is a view that we are not part of Leeds. Leeds is over there we don't want to be part of Leeds"

WCP5 Changes in the wider policy environment

Outlines changes to Leeds and the implications on these changes on the need for improved cultural infrastructure.
"If you go back 15 years an extremely parochial city with a lot of indigenous businesses within the city and what we have found in the last few years, a lot of big firms have either moved to Leeds or they have consolidated their headquarters."

Issue that there has been strong economic performance in Leeds without coordinated strategy in marketing

"For the last 15 years we have been the fastest growing city in the UK. without having a coordinated marketing endeavour".

Same can be said of tourism growth in the business sector has followed on from the strength in the economy as a whole.

**CO Council Organisation**

Indicates the complex and fragmented structure that existed until a year ago. Says that restructuring

"has provided more clarity to be honest because 12 months ago.... we had tourism within leisure services, we had inward investment within the Leeds Development Agency and we had City Centre Management on its own and the Leeds Initiative on its own.

The main restructuring happened in April but the decision to move tourism happened at a later after.

"we didn't take the decision about transferring tourism until about last July/August."

Refers to the restructure of the city centre group and improvements arising from that in terms of making decisions and budgetary control

"And now they are one department those things are coming together. "

"At least if you are in one department you've got one director then you can get a clear view then about whether they can find the money"

**CC01 Communication within the Local Authority**

Talks about the new arrangements to move a number of functions under one department and improve coordination. Specifically relationships between tourism and marketing have improved.
"What we’ve now got is City Centre Management, tourism and inward investment all under one manager within the Development Department. ....so we can work much more close together and try to get a strategy which is much more aligned that we could have previously – so there are major benefits. I would say that the relationship between ourselves and the tourism team has been much better since that change"

Referring to city centre issues and the improvements in communication since restructuring . Easier to get an overview on priorities and agree spending if policy is clearly within the remit of one director.

"Previously there were 2 directors and they were both saying we can’t find the money so it never happens."

Difficulties of developing corporate culture and good communications in such a large organisation.

"But when you are talking about the organisation like Leeds which has got 34,000 staff across 7 departments and some of those departments are very big (Social services has got 6,000 staff). It is very difficult to get that culture coming through. There will still be people out there who aren’t integrated with the other services and don’t recognise they have a wider community role across a whole range of services"

Says that some parts of the Council that haven’t quite embraced partnership and corporate working.

"it is inevitable in terms of people identifying with their own work, their own people their own ideas and if you are trying to tweak that with a more corporate approach it is sometimes difficult. So there is still some work to do there."

Choices that need to be made between different priorities and spending. When talking about the new initiative “Marketing Leeds” he identifies a range of different marketing initiatives that exist within the Council and from the Leeds initiative that have differently objectives.

“Separately to that our inward investment team who are trying to attract businesses to relocate or evolve and develop within the city - separately to that a City Centre Team who are marketing the vitality and the offer of the City Centre from a retail and a nightlife perspective and maybe even separately to that the Leeds Initiative trying to promote and market the city in its wider sense.” The use of separately is key here.
Issues about coordination and integration of marketing approaches. Identifies the need for improvements in consistency and integration across the organisation.

"So little pockets of work being done to market and promote Leeds but they tend to give different messages—So no coordination in terms of what the key messages are that we are seeking to portray or what the marking approach ought to be— from the consistency perspective and that is where we need good organisation".

Points to relatively recent collaboration between tourism and marketing officers in developing a Marketing Strategy

"that is really where my linking in and relationship between L6 and the tourism team has sort of developed from there."

"We think we are wonderful but out there nobody knows..... need to work together, collectively, to respond to that." Brahm report – perceptions research has implications on the Councils approach to marketing the City and pressure to improve coordination between organisations/council departments to ensure one clear message emerges about the city.

CCO1 Restructuring at local level has provided more clarity (potentially more coordination)- tourism not moved until later

CCO2 Communication between the LA and other local organisations

Need for coordination between different sectors at local level

"Everyone in the city needs to see this as a collective approach. It is not just what the Council do—i.e. what are the Universities doing to market the City in order to attract students? What are the major hospitals doing? ..... What's the Chamber of Commerce doing?"

Idea that improved coordination could lead to more extensive and effective action.

"..if we somehow start to bring these things together in a coordinated way and a coordinated strategy we could do much more."

Says that the individual business benefit from increased tourism and investment in the city and they must get more involved.

A number of partnership initiatives identified in the WCP section that improve communication between local organisations across sectors. An example would be "Marketing Leeds" which has been set up by LCC and the Chamber of Commerce and focuses on a joint effort to promote and market the city.
"We think we are wonderful but out there no-body knows.... need to work together, collectively, to respond to that."

Brahm report – perceptions research has implications on the Councils approach to marketing the City and pressure to improve coordination between organisations/council departments to ensure one clear message emerges about the city.

CCO3 Communication between the LA and the region
Evidence of lack of consensus between regional and local level. Indicates that the concept of a DMO is a problem and also concerns with West Yorkshire sub regional structure View that Leeds has a wider role outside of the sub regional level

“So West Yorkshire, is a sub region - it would have what they call a Destination Management organisation (DMO) which we struggled with – with the concept - in terms of what responsibilities would that body have and I must admit it was a lack of detail it was hard to get beneath it.”

“We struggled with the concept of it being a sub region i.e. what is West Yorkshire as a brand well actually it is nothing.... it is just 3 districts.... very urbanised– very different in terms of the product. .....our offer in terms of brand really does extend into Selby and York in North Yorkshire. We are really questioning the validity of doing something on a sub regional basis”

Identifies a clear reason why communication should be good with Yorkshire Forward major funding role in terms of proposed marketing partnership.

“The maximum contribution is going to come from, hopefully, Yorkshire Forward. We are putting in a bid of just short of £900,000 over the next 5 years and that will be supplemented by a “membership champion scheme.”

P2 Regional Policy
The notion that new organisations make changes and need to be seen to be doing something different.

“Yorkshire Forward has taken responsibility for the Yorkshire Tourist Board. Yorkshire Forward , being new decided to get consultants to undertake a review of the Yorkshire Tourist Board and its role and they have made a number of proposals. They have agreed that is probably too big in terms of the overall board to be a truly effective membership and product development body because the product does vary across the region– the tourism product. And therefore
they are proposing to change the role and format YTB and set up sub regional bodies."

"Yorkshire has a brand...... And the suggestion that – actually that can work quite negatively against of what the offer of Leeds is in terms of being an urban tourism offer. The Yorkshire Brand can actually work against it. That people assume the Yorkshire Brand is actually the same as the Leeds Brand."

Other respondents question notions about "branding" of cities or regions(see also regional interview). In this context "Brand" refers to the image of Yorkshire in terms of its country and rural activities which are seen to be at odds with the urban offer in Leeds. This idea is not supported by L3 who sees the regional offer enhancing the city offer.

TS Tourism Service
Outlines the range of services provided by tourism team. "so L6 and her team do the whole gambit of product development, tourism policy, strategy and marketing, the offer of short conference desk facilities the Tourist Information Centre and all of that."

R3 Research Findings
"Last year we undertook a fairly detailed piece of perception research work through Brahm. It cost us £80,000 so it was a lot of money and it was probably one of the biggest pieces of research work that we've done for a number of years."

This is reported further under WCP4 Public perceptions

KP Key People
Importance of key people in communication and developing integrated and corporate approaches. Talks about the likely impact of the departure of the director on social services on the integration of those services with other areas.

"its about how its led and the director has just left ....and now I can start to see that their will be a different culture in the department where they are more open to working with others to respond to some of the issues."

Tourism Issues
Indication that smaller conference sector is significant supported by hotel growth.

"We do get a lot (of conferences) within the hotels and smaller venues but we don't get the bigger events. The growth of hotels is massive."
Appendix 6: Maps of different Regional Initiatives
Appendix 7: Background information about Cambridge

Why was Cambridge chosen?

An initial investigation was undertaken into 25 local authorities to assess their suitability for further detailed study. This involved further analysis of their responses to the 2000 survey, an investigation into the availability and nature of current and historic plan/policy information, preliminary research into policy and marketing information on the web and their response to best value (involvement in pilot etc). This investigation aimed to identify those authorities that were actively engaged in the tourism policy making, and were developing policy and practice to take account of wider changes i.e. web presence and the best value process. Policy documentation was considered in more depth and 3 authorities were identified who very clearly identified/conceptualised tourism policy within its wider context. These three authorities were considered to be most likely to provide deep and rich primary data on the basis of their tourism policy history and sense of contextuality.

The three authorities were Cambridge City Council, Leeds Metropolitan District and the New Forest District Council. The three authorities were vastly different in terms of their product, their structures and services and their approach to tourism and a number of difficulties were apparent in trying to develop two case studies with an element of comparison. After some deliberation the decision was made to focus on two "destinations" which were largely city based and to recognise from the outset that common themes may not emerge in tourism policy making.

The similarities between the two cities arise on the basis that both are relatively prosperous and rely on the activities of a range of business and industries and a strong education sector for their prosperity. Both recognise that tourism has a role, in terms of the economic "health" of the city but perceive that role to be secondary to many other activities. Both express an overriding concern about the needs and aspirations of residents and hostility in one and apathy in the other temper their engagement in tourism policy-making. The University sector plays a significant role as a stakeholder and service/attraction provider in the tourism sector in both cities. Both cities have experienced unprecedented hotel expansion in the past 5-10 years as their role as a
destination develops and changes. Both cities express a strong sense of civic pride – particularly strong in Leeds – proactive policy responses.

Background to Cambridge

Cambridge is an historic city, a renowned education centre and a regional centre for arts, cultural and retail activities (Human & Maitland 2003; C4, 2004). It has a strong diverse economy and has benefited from the expansion in the knowledge based industries. Its attracts tourists, predominantly in connection with the historic traditions/buildings and art collections connected with its Colleges. Cambridge produced its first tourism plan in 1978 and has produced a series of plans and strategies every 5-6 years since then culminating in the most recent tourism strategy in 2001 (Human & Maitland). Tourism policy concerns relate to the growing number of visitors in the historic city centre, pressures for new visitor accommodation and other facilities and traffic management problems DETR (2001) Current policy initiatives aim to convert day visitors to staying visitors and to manage some of the negative impacts arising from tourism in the City (C1, C2, C3 and C4).

Cambridge is smaller that Leeds both in terms of its geographical size, and in terms of its population 108,900 (2001, census) as compared to 717,000 (LCC, 2003). Consequently it has smaller scale and less complex policy making and delivery structures than Leeds. There are some examples of partnership working in Cambridge, but unlike Leeds, policy making is not made under the auspices of a local strategic partnership. Leeds claims to have 18 million day visits per year (LCC, 2001) and Cambridge 4.1million (Human and Maitland, 2003), but the Leeds data includes day visits from within the region, whereas the Cambridge data does not. (check)

The material collected in Cambridge is developed from the perspectives of people involved in policy making at the local level only. Regional policy has been developed by consultants and the RDA officer declined to be interviewed, claiming she is unable to discuss the implementation of policy beyond the published policies in the plan. C1, C2, C3 and C4 identify the minimal communication between the region (RDA and RTB) and Cambridge City Council (CCC) and as a consequence the interview material is predominantly focussed on local issues in tourism policy. These include the specific
tourism problems in Cambridge and the issues affecting the LA's provision of tourism services; the relationship between tourism policy and wider policy; the extent and nature of communication between tourism policy makers and other interests at the local level and the nature of changes in the local policy environment.

The Cambridge Interviews were undertaken in phase 2 of the primary research process. Five interviews were carried out with people who are involved in tourism policy-making and service delivery in Cambridge including one councillor, 3 officers and the Bursar of one of the Colleges. The interviews took place over a period spanning August 2004 to January 2005, after the first phase of Leeds interviews had been undertaken, transcribed and coded. A semi structured approach to interviewing was adopted and these interviews were coded and themed using grounded theory. The codes developed for Cambridge were grounded in the data rather than being imported from the Leeds case study. There were significant areas of overlap and in these areas the coding approach from Leeds could be adopted and developed to reflect the nuances in the data. There were also a number of significant differences (i.e. the region was not perceived to have a direct involvement in tourism policy) and a number of new codes were developed to reflect and record these differences. The Cambridge study led to the creation of comparative data and important insights into developing codes, concepts and themes in Leeds. The constant comparison of data between the case studies help identify common patterns and enabled higher-level codes to be adopted. Memo's were written to discuss the meaning and implications of convergence across the data presented in both case studies.