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Abstract: This chapter proposes a methodology to determine tourism policies that are effective in addressing the challenges of tourism as an instrument for development. A three-step process is proposed, including the preparation of a Green Paper that defines the different actors in the tourism system, as well as their functions vis-à-vis policy options; a White Paper that determines strategic positioning and a roadmap for action based on the diagnosis and analysis of the destination; and a Tourism Policy Plan that delineates the different governance actions. The model is examined from the perspective of the use of tourism as an instrument for development, with a consideration of the destination’s human, social capital, and participative governance systems. Keywords: Policy, governance, strategic positioning, white paper, development

INTRODUCTION

Even in the context of a neoliberal paradigm in economics, development and political science, the need for a properly structured tourism policy has
become evident in recent decades. Both the private sector and public agencies have realized the growing importance of setting proper institutional frameworks for the competitiveness and sustainability of tourism activities at a sectorial level (Edgell, Allen, Smith & Swanson, 2008; Hall, 2000b). In parallel, the academic literature has acknowledged the need for regulation of tourism and the importance of establishing an appropriate institutional structure to achieve competitiveness. Thus, many studies have discussed at length prevailing practices, while identifying existing challenges. Scott (2011) provides an in-depth review of the academic literature in this area.

Beyond the concern for competitive sectorial frameworks, however, governments have increasingly seen tourism as a tool of more ambitious transversal policies aiming to create employment and income in deprived areas of a country, and even able to contribute to development in its broader sense (Fayos-Sola & Pedro, 2001). From the 1990s, official tourism promotion and marketing documents of many governments have evolved toward white papers and tourism policy plans, indicating a much wider approach to the role and capabilities of tourism in contemporary societies (European Commission, 2007, 2011; Fayos-Sola, 1994; OECD, 2003; SETUR, 2007; SGT, 1992, 2007; UK, 2011).

The previous chapter addressed the requirement for tourism to contribute to the development of the destination by combining a sustainability perspective with the need for checks and limits to reduce negative impacts. A political system that ensures the active participation of various stakeholders in decisionmaking is central to the issue. Such a participative approach becomes essential to ensure that the cost and benefits of tourism are shared by all members of the community. Additionally, the aim is to achieve development that is balanced at the national, regional, and local level (Tosun, 2001).

Even though the government is bound to play a key role in the organization of tourism, the current thinking among academicians and practitioners is that destination strategies need to be based on a consensus, and the coordination of measures and actions from different parties, including the entrepreneurial sector, the government, and civil society. Given the fragmented nature of decisionmaking at destinations, a system that balances the needs and interests of the various stakeholders is required. Thus, tourism policies are obliged to start from the definition of strategic positioning and a set of common objectives that may bring all interested parties together, and that may be achieved through adaptive mechanisms.

In this context, tourism policy is understood as the set of systemic actions carried out by public administrations, the entrepreneurial sector, and civil society with specific social, economic, and environmental objectives. These
objectives may be merely instrumental and concerned exclusively with the competitiveness of the industry, or aiming to achieve ultimate goals for the whole of society, such as development. In line with a collaborative approach that is increasingly viewed as a necessary condition in setting a policy plan, a network of stakeholders must be involved in processes referring to the attraction and satisfaction of tourists whose expectations and perceptions can be modeled by the destination actors. This system of interested parties must also ensure the continuous active participation of all agents concerned in the design and implementation of the plan. To this end, the tourism policy agents act upon certain variables or *instruments* of the plan, whether these are regulatory or in the way of economic stimuli. Structured avenues of collaboration for given instrumental goals are usually named *programs*. Specific uses of instruments are generally referred to as *measures*, and these may consist of one or several *actions*. Instruments, programs, measures, and actions are used by the governance bodies and agents to implement a tourism policy plan.

Chapter 3 discussed the FAS model which allows for a better understanding of the destination’s tourism system, the building of a shared vision, and the estimation of the effects of policies. The current chapter builds on this model and proposes a methodology to determine policies that are effective in addressing the challenges of tourism as an instrument for development. Based on the exhaustive analysis of the destination’s factors, attractors, and support systems according to the FAS model, a Tourism Policy Plan is defined. This plan includes the instruments to be used and a set of programs and subprograms, as well as an indication of the type of measures and actions that may be taken in order to achieve the destination’s objectives and strategies. This discussion starts with a definition of what is meant by tourism policies in the context of the use of sustainable tourism for development. A three-step process includes the preparation of:

- A *Green Paper* that analyzes the structure and dynamics of the destination, defines the different tourism actors, and clarifies the property and control rights of each interested party and hence their capability to act;
- A *White Paper* for analysis and evaluation of the existing data in order to determine and adopt a strategic positioning based upon the alternatives identified, the instrumental and final objectives to be reached, and a long-term roadmap for action; and
- A *Tourism Policy Plan* that delineates the different instruments, programs, measures, and actions, as well as their implementation through institutional setups.
Further, the chapter addresses the need to formalize the institutional arrangements in a governance system that allow for the coordination of the different stakeholders, while at the same time providing leadership and decisionmaking capabilities at multiple levels.

TOURISM POLICIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

The need for regulation of the tourism industry stems from the realization that it may be the cause of significant external effects, outside the scope of market mechanisms: social and economic as well as environmental. In the use of tourism as an instrument for development, the objectives of sustainability and development, as well as a balance between both, need to be achieved through a conscious establishment of indicators, programs, and institutional rules.

The concept of tourism policy has been the subject of numerous articles in the academic literature. As mentioned, Scott’s (2011) review of some of the existing conceptual explanations determines that most definitions provided by the literature acknowledge the role of government as the main responsible entity in organizing and regulating tourism. The leading part of the government can be seen in the decisions made at different levels by authorities. This view proposes that the state is a key actor of tourism governance systems, acting through institutions and mechanisms that are able to direct society. Baum and Szivas (2008) note that the role of the state in policy and planning increases as the perceived importance of tourism as a development tool and creator of employment grows. According to Hall, the government helps shape the economic framework for the tourism industry ... helps provide the infrastructure and educational requirements for tourism, establishes the regulatory environment in which business operates, and takes an active role in promotion and marketing (2000b, p. 135).

Other scholars have recognized that in such a fragmented industry, policies cannot be established without the cooperation of all interested parties. Bramwell (2006b) argues that there is a blurring of the role of state and nonstate actors in tourism policymaking and advocates the analysis of tourism policy under a network perspective. This network view focuses on the identification of relevant actors, both individuals and organizations, in
order to increase success in the design and implementation of tourism policies.

In adopting this same approach, more than 20 years ago, the Brundtland Commission (WCED, 1987) proposed the concept of participation as a *sine-qua-non* requisite for sustainable development, in sharp contrast to the purely economic premises of the Washington Consensus. At about the same time, the United Nations Development Program undertook to produce their *Human Development Reports* with the goal of studying “… how this [economic] growth translate—or fails to translate—into human development in different societies” and “putting people at the centre of the development process” (UNDP, 1990, p. iii).

Tourism policy has paid lip service in many countries to the concept of development but, as considered in Chapter 2, there are few records of effective action in this respect for at least two reasons. To begin with, there is a misleading understanding of the complexities of development, which is often equated with economic growth and other proxy variables such as employment or income that tourism may foster. The second reason refers to the conventional vision that tourism for development can be an exogenously initiated mechanism, designed in a top-down manner, and able to proceed with only passive commitment of the local institutions and citizens.

But the pretension of tourism policy as a powerful instrument for development has lacked specification of instruments, programs, measures, and actions. Besides, policy programs in tourism have often been conducted by a variety of policymakers with diverse views and different interests (Airey & Chong, 2010). Then, most importantly, the central question of involving local social and institutional capital and stakeholders has been rarely dealt with. The fragmented and transversal nature of the tourism industry, involving many local agents with different interests and motivations, requires a serious consideration of the issue of governance. As such, participation of different stakeholders not only ensures an effective and efficient implementation of policy plans, but also represents an essential condition for tourism as an instrument of development.

*A Methodology for Tourism Policy and Governance*

Tourism policy customarily encompasses governmental decisions aimed at regulating the industry and at achieving predefined strategic aims for the destination. Tourism as a contributor to development needs to consider the objectives of economic growth, employment creation, and fair distribution of the benefits to all constituents in the destination, while maintaining
a balance between conservation and development. Thus, the need for planning and defining specific instruments for action arises, even more so vis-à-vis the contemporary views on development.

In this context, the process of defining tourism policies needs to be based on a formal methodology (vid supra, Chapter 3) that allows for the diagnosis of the destination’s surrounding environment (socioeconomic, environmental, and technological) as well as the analysis of its own internal structure (resources/factors, attractors, and support systems) and its dynamics (agents interrelations and behavior). Additionally, a collaborative approach for planning and policy implementation is favored, resulting in the need to incorporate both governmental institutions at different levels and stakeholders from the private sector and the civil society.

In line with the aim of bridging the gap between theory and practice, a template for the formulation of tourism policies and a governance model is proposed. The model examined in this chapter is based on discussions at the European Regional Commission of UNWTO and the subsequent proposal by Fayos-Solà, Fuentes and Muñoz (2012b). The methodology used is reviewed in terms of its capacity to address the need to conserve the resources of the destination, following the sustainability paradigm, and the objective of tourism to act as an instrument that favors development. The development process of a policy plan is based on an exhaustive analysis of the destination through a Green Paper, and a strategic positioning and roadmap for action summarized in a White Paper, as explained below. These documents act as supporting elements of the policy plan and provide the framework within which the tourism policy programs will be defined. A proactive participatory involvement of the stakeholders is sought from the start, already at the Green Paper stage, although governance rules and institutional arrangements may be formalized in the context of the Tourism Policy Plan formulation.

The Green Paper for Tourism Policy

In preparing a Tourism Policy Plan it is important to (a) ensure that a preliminary exercise of analysis and understanding of the tourism system is properly carried out. Even if the responsible governmental departments are well acquainted with the destination(s)’ concerns, this stage should also include all the other stakeholders involved. Additionally, this is the time to (b) jointly examine the instruments and resources available for the task, and to (c) identify and involve the institutions and agents likely to participate, as
well as establish their capacity to contribute. Unfortunately, this stage is
very often bypassed in the belief that this is merely a technical prerequisite,
and that many stakeholders can later on be incorporated into the policy
process.

Based on a network view of tourism policy, the Green Paper represents
the initial step that addresses the need to legitimize the process and to
consider the cost-benefits of tourism from the perspective of all interested
parties. A participative process in the elaboration of policies is especially
important for those destinations in the developing world that are looking to
address some of the challenges to development, such as the nonequitable
distribution of the benefits and the control of resources by private groups
or rich capital owners. There are additional advantages in adopting a
governance approach in this stage, such as avoiding conflict resolution
costs in the long term and lowering agreement and transaction costs.

Discussion of policy alternatives and strategies during the Green Paper
stage may simulate a “veil of ignorance”. This follows the classical
approach of philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes, Immanuel Kant, Jean-
Jacques Rousseau, or Thomas Jefferson, who defend that a balanced dis-
cussion leading to a social contract (and indeed public decisions) requires
that stakeholders do not yet know their likely individual position and out-
comes when resources and rights are regulated. Harsanyi (1955, 1976) and
then Rawls (1971, 2001) reinstate the idea in modern terms, applying the
concept of fairness to decisionmaking processes particularly in public eco-
nomics. Figure 1 summarizes the four phases usually taken in the prepara-
tion of a Green Paper of tourism policy.

Thus, the Green Paper starts with (a) the identification of stakeholders,
whether interest groups or individual actors in tourism, as well as their
position in the social-institutional capital framework; then (b) a selection
and classification of these stakeholders is made based on these positions;
and (c) finally the process concludes with (d) the definition of the methods
that will be used in order to obtain their views and ideas, including in-depth
interviews, workshops, think-tanks, surveys, and (e) building a general
agreement around the results. This latter phase of the process recognizes
the importance of collective knowledge and self-reflection. The aim is to
achieve a consensus and encourage the participation of the greatest number
of tourism agents in the definition of objectives and strategies. The result
should be a Green Paper document that identifies the principal actors in the
system, allocates functions and responsibilities to each of them, and starts
the planning process in a participative and consultative manner.
In consequence, a Green Paper for tourism policy is defined here as a tool resulting from a collective knowledge of existing social-institutional, human, natural, physical and financial capital resources, mechanisms and processes, analysing the existing factors, attractors and support services for tourism, as well as the role of specific agents (internal and external to the destination), with the purpose of establishing the capacities, potential positions and responsibilities of the agents in tourism policy design and implementation (Fayos-Sola et al., 2012b, p. 47).

The White Paper for Tourism Policy

Following the Green Paper, the White Paper is a document that evaluates the current situation, as established in the Green Paper, and determines possible success strategies, as well as the capacities of institutions at the destination to respond to changing conditions and demands. In this sense,
the White Paper carries out a diagnosis of the current state of the tourism industry at the destination facing the larger demand scenarios. The first phase of a White Paper usually consists of a preliminary evaluation of the tourism possibilities of the destination vis-à-vis external markets, based on the collective knowledge gathered in the Green Paper stage. There is frequently a need for additional knowledge and expertise in view of likely strategic positioning decisions.

The second phase considers the situation from two different domains, the basic and the relational. The basic domain focuses on each of the components of the tourism experience. Thus, the three dimensions of tourism factors/resources, attractors, and support systems are evaluated following the Green Paper results and the FAS methodology proposed in Chapter 3. The classification of the system into these three main dimensions provides the ability to determine the current and potential situation of the destination based on its tourism components. Additionally, a diagnosis of the destination should also include an external analysis (using for instance PESTEL methodology, an analysis and evaluation of political, economic, social, technological, ecological, and legal external dynamic scenarios), as well as an internal evaluation of current trends, following the classic SWOT analysis that aims to identify the destination’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

On the other hand, the relational domain considers the knowledge and interests of the actors who interact in the destination, the “veil of ignorance” now totally lifted. Therefore, with knowledge from the Green Paper, the functions of each actor and the relations among the different stakeholders become a key starting point for the definition of tourism policies. This is an important aspect for the use of this industry as an instrument for development, since the destination’s human and social capital become an essential component that determines the competitiveness of the destination and its ability to foster development. Figure 2 summarizes the external and internal analysis of both the basic and relational domains in the preparation of a White Paper.

The third phase in the making of a White Paper refers to a key diagnosis, not of the present situation, but of options referring to the strategic positioning of the destination. The comparative advantages, which have become evident in the Green Paper stage and the FAS diagnosis, act as the bases to now determine which competitive advantages can be achieved and maintained (through dedicated capital investments) and, specifically, which are politically possible and desirable in the context of existing social-institutional capital, property, and control rights.
This will lead to the fourth phase, when the main strategic positioning of the destination must be finally decided. It is obvious that phase 3, and especially phase 4, are decisionmaking processes with high political content. The veil of ignorance is now totally lifted and the positioning adopted has deep implications for programs, measures and actions within the forthcoming Tourism Policy Plan. Proper knowledge acquired in the preparation of the Green and White Papers about the diverse forms of capital available and comparative and competitive advantages indicate the knowledge and technological frontiers in decisionmaking, although a governance process is also indispensable at this stage. Figure 3 summarizes all these four phases recommended in the preparation of a White Paper for tourism policy.

It should be again emphasized that this is not a straightforward technical exercise. Political issues and decisions cannot be postponed to the moment of approval and subsequent implementation of a Tourism Policy Plan, as is often the case. Governance procedures are important from the start in the Green Paper, but become essential in the preparation of the White Paper. Therefore, a White Paper for tourism policy is defined here.
as a key analytical and diagnostic tool that identifies a destination’s comparative and subsequent possible competitive advantages for tourism. It also provides for a political governance choice by concerned stakeholders, and a strategic position in external markets; then, it outlines their respective roles in both. This strategic positioning is the departure point towards a roadmap defining specific objectives and strategies in a coherent policy plan (Fayos-Solà et al., 2012b, p. 50).

**The Tourism Policy Plan**

Once the Green Paper and the White Paper have set the framework for the tourism system to evolve, establishing objectives, strategies, as well as roles and functions for the diverse actors, the need to determine specific programs for action and implementation instruments arises. To constitute a fully-fledged *Tourism Policy Plan*, these programs must encompass all applied knowledge necessary in order to implement the strategies adopted.
They must form a coherent set of actions that refer to the process of analysis, attraction, reception, and evaluation of tourism in a destination. They must specify instrumental ends and means, as well as the stakeholders involved and their capacity to proactively participate. Thus, a Tourism Policy Plan is

a normative tool, based on the Green and White Papers, that encompasses a set of programs, subprograms and actions, intended to implement predetermined strategies and achieve specific dynamic objectives. It is designed and implemented through consensus or majority decisionmaking by a governance system which includes all relevant stakeholders. It refers to issues of competitiveness, sustainability, and ultimately development, and it uses instruments in the areas of market intelligence, attraction, satisfaction and loyalty of customers and other actors, with a view to the maximization of benefits for the tourism destination (Fayos-Sola` et al., 2012b, p. 50).

However, even when technically correct, most plans aim only for the optimization of sectorial objectives, such as competitiveness. Often, macro objectives such as employment, income, sustainability, and development are taken for granted. However, if development is not a clear and explicit objective of tourism policy, it will hardly be seriously considered when discussing and establishing the programs of a policy plan. It is especially important that development that reflects an equitable distribution of the resources derived from tourism and an increase in the quality of life of the community should be well thought and planned.

Therefore, it is not surprising that an examination of such programs reveals a lack of specificity about instruments, measures, and actions that could show performance in key areas for development, such as the formation of human capital and the strengthening of certain institutions. As recently as 2010, UNWTO was expressing the need for “paving the way for a greater insight into the potential of tourism in economic development”, and determining that “the way towards a more effective, efficient and sustainable management in a tourism sector that enhances economic well-being means taking a proactive stance in positioning tourism to shape national policy” (2010a, pp. 1, 4).

During the last few years, both the OECD and UNWTO have been active in establishing an encompassing framework for tourism policy plans and programs; these efforts were later joined by the European Commission.
Regarding specific programs to be considered, the OECD makes recommendations to (a) stimulate innovation; (b) improve the attractiveness of employment in tourism; (c) enhance the uniqueness of destinations; (d) make tourism development more energy efficient and sustainable; (e) reduce obstacles to the development of tourism; and (f) build up tourism knowledge. The OECD also recognizes the importance of policies and institutional frameworks, such as establishing comprehensive policy frameworks; promoting coherent frameworks through a “whole of government” approach; encouraging a culture of cooperation among tourism actors; and implementing the evaluation and performance assessment of policies and programs affecting tourism development (2008, pp. 3–4).

In addition, the European Commission, with its newly acquired competencies in tourism since the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009, has begun establishing wide priorities for a European Tourism Policy. These may be summarized as (a) mainstreaming measures affecting tourism, (b) fostering tourism sustainability, and (c) enhancing the understanding and visibility of tourism (European Commission, 2010, 2011).

UNWTO (2010b), in the context of policy discussions in its Regional Commission for Europe, has proposed a standardized framework for policy strategic design and implementation. After analyzing tourism policy experiences in Europe and other regions of the world, this proposal recognizes the importance of systematizing programs and instruments, while providing ample flexibility for the concrete design and implementation of measures and concrete actions, depending on existing institutions as well as social and human capital. Figure 4 summarizes the main contents of such proposal.

In order to implement the strategies for tourism policy that have been derived from the White and the Green Papers, several key areas for action are identified and concrete programs and specific actions are devised. These key priority areas include intelligence, sustainability, knowledge, excellence, promotion/communication, innovation, and governance. These represent the priority concerns and are selected as the main fields for intervention.

**Intelligence/Info Program.** Among the programs, a priority is the creation of an information and intelligence system able to provide continuous quantitative and qualitative information, current and projected. Therefore, the intelligence/info program is designed to continuously generate information concerning the different components of the tourism system. It provides research concerning the variables indispensable for decisionmaking, such as demand, supply, markets, and effects on the provision of diverse forms of capital (including human and social capital). In addition, a systematic way
for analysis and evaluation of the data must be defined. As Vellas (2011) points out, it is important to consider and measure all direct, indirect, and induced effects of tourism. This is now facilitated by the Tourism Satellite Account methodology (UNWTO, 2008), a cornerstone for making economic evaluations of many direct effects of tourism.

However, Frechtling (2011) has analyzed the boundaries of the Tourism Satellite Account method of measuring the tourism economic contributions to a country. The Tourism Satellite Account is based on the values of tourism consumption of certain specified products and services produced by specified tourism businesses; these are among the “direct” effects of tourism demand on the national economy. Nevertheless there are other direct effects as well as many “secondary impacts”, including both “indirect” and “induced” effects. “By design, none of these are captured in the Tourism Satellite Account. Estimating secondary effects requires moving from defining and populating accounts to designing and implementing economic models” (Frechtling, 2011, p. 4). The most widely used models are the Input-Output Model; the Social Accounting Matrix, and the Computable
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General Equilibrium Model. These can be extremely useful when trying to obtain both information and adequate intelligence for the use of tourism as an instrument for development and thus should be considered in detail when designing and implementing an intelligence/info program within a Tourism Policy Plan.

Additionally, there is the issue of bridging the wide gaps between the generation of information and intelligence, and the dissemination of these among stakeholders and decisionmakers in general. The solution can no longer be the existing practice of extreme simplification, focusing only on numbers of incoming tourists and/or the resulting foreign exchange. Only if adequate indicators for tourism-generated development are established and fed with reliable data, can the development-related instrumental objectives be really considered in policy.

All in all, an intelligence/info program must generate adequate inputs and feedback for other agenda in a Tourism Policy Plan. These information and feedback inputs must be specific for sustainability, knowledge management, quality and process reengineering, promotion, innovation, and governance. They need to provide, for example, concrete information on the effects of regulatory provisions on the actual flows of tourism, returns on product, service and infrastructure investments, conservation of resources, and evolution of human and social-institutional capital. This should prove essential when monitoring all indicators referring to development issues.

**Sustainability Program.** Another key aspect of tourism is the need for sustainability of resources, for the conservation and provision of specific stocks of natural, human, social, and physical capital. In particular, as discussed in Chapter 4, the sustainability paradigm may help focus on those tourism practices that ensure a healthy and equitable development at the destination. Therefore, a key aspect of implementing policies refers to programs and action plans that take into consideration issues such as carrying capacity, environmental quality, social integration and welfare, as well as socio-territorial balance.

While sustainability is considered as desirable for destinations, in practice there are many challenges that need to be addressed by adequate instruments and programs. Despite the great number of studies in the academic literature that deal with sustainability, the concept is far from operational and scholars have yet to agree on its boundaries and on the indicators used to measure it (McCool, Moisey & Nickerson, 2001; Soteriou & Coccossis, 2010). Thus, the definition of specific sustainability aims and measurement instruments should be considered as a priority within the sustainability...
program. In particular, carrying capacity and impact assessment studies specific to the destination can provide the necessary tools to analyze the current situation and design limits to the tourism industry.

In addition, the fragmented nature of the tourism activity presents a further challenge for the coordination of sustainability policies at the destination. The leading role in designing and implementing sustainability practices usually falls to the government and public authorities (Soteriou & Coccossis, 2010). Nevertheless, in line with the participatory approach advocated earlier, the program may include a stakeholder analysis that specifies the role and responsibilities of the different actors in the protection of the resources at the destination, establishing a balance between the public and the private sector.

Sustainability that contributes to the development of the destination entails in many cases the need to limit tourism and give priority to long-term conservation and provision of capital, rather than short-term economic gain. Thus, a sustainability orientation of the different stakeholders becomes important (Mitchell, Wooliscroft, & Higham, 2013). Specific actions may be outlined to provide the community with education and training to support a more sustainable perspective.

Therefore, the sustainability program is to maintain the sustainability of the destination through the optimization of the long-term benefits per unit of investment, in terms of natural as well as other forms of capital. Specific areas of activity within the program include impact assessment, carrying capacity and indicator monitoring studies, conservation and balance related actions, a program for social integration and welfare through tourism, as well as steps to improve the support services at the destination.

Knowledge Program. In the knowledge economy, the important role of human capital as a source of competitive advantage and a key factor for development is increasingly recognized for organizations and communities alike. Human capital is defined as “the set of individual skills held by the members of the organization, whether they are components of the governing bodies, the management, the administrative and technical structure or external collaborators” (Fontana, 2012, p. 796). Or, as perhaps more clearly expressed in Chapter 2, following Cañibano (2005, pp. 257–66), human capital refers to the stock of capabilities and knowledge possessed by individuals, and susceptible to be used in the institutions of society. It is an ample notion that transcends limited approaches focusing exclusively on economic productivity. In tourism, these skills, capabilities, attributes, and competences include professional and organizational aspects; they may also
encompass a tourism orientation or a sustainability perspective among the members of the community.

The management of the human capital of the destination is a complex issue, since the coexistence of several products result in a variety of available occupations and a requirement for very diverse skills (Baum & Szivas, 2008). Additionally, larger and more established organizations coincide with micro-businesses and small- and medium-sized organizations, which may be very different in terms of the availability of training budgets, career opportunities, and remuneration (Baum & Szivas, 2008). For many destinations seasonality may be an additional challenge to the capability to support a skilled and motivated workforce.

Investing in human capital is especially important for destinations in developing countries, since a priori they may be in a position of relative disadvantage vis-à-vis more developed and industrialized nations. In a destination that is unable to provide a skilled and educated workforce, the benefits of tourism usually go to outsiders, since the community is unable to engage in this activity (Liu & Wall, 2006). If tourism is to bring forth development and increase the quality of life of the people at the destination, it needs to be complemented with specific actions directed at establishing a knowledge base.

Actions are required for providing research, training, and education in order to improve the competitiveness of the destination. Other aspects may include establishing operational standards and accreditation systems, and conducting research to establish the curriculum needs for vocational and professional education. A package of actions that aim to generate, disseminate, and apply knowledge in tourism are suggested under the heading of knowledge program. This program especially addresses the needs of the human capital, enhancing the quality of life, both personal and professional, for the individuals at the destination.

Excellence Program. Providing high quality services is recognized as a critical success factor for destinations that are increasingly facing high competition (Bornhorst, Ritchie & Sheehan, 2010), especially due to the fact that tourists are becoming progressively more sophisticated and are demanding quality and value for money (Sharpley & Forster, 2003). However, providing and increasing the quality at the destination is a challenge, closely linked to the conservation and provision of social-institutional capital, especially due to the fact that it requires the control of many diverse components. Furthermore, different organizations within the destination may be empowered to manage various services that are offered as part of the total destination product.
The tourism product needs to be considered from the perspective of the total travel experience, and hence it is important for destinations to ensure that the various components that create that experience are provided with an attention to overall excellence. Successful collaboration of different actors and organizations is a key to obtaining a quality product. Integration among stakeholders and a framework that helps improve the quality of the various components of the destination are required (Go & Govers, 2000). Regulations and formal certifications can also assist by increasing the general standards in the industry and by providing criteria for benchmarking.

In the use of tourism as an instrument for development, an additional challenge emerges. As mentioned before, a leakage from the benefits of tourism is more likely to occur in the least developed countries, since they are often unable to meet the high standards of quality required, and may need to rely on outside resources (Muhanna, 2007). Thus, specific actions for increasing the overall competitiveness of the destination need to include consideration of increasing the quality through support to local stakeholders, and even explicit action on human as well as social-institutional capital.

Therefore, the sectoral, instrumental objective of the excellence program is to improve the level of satisfaction of all the tourism parties, including the producers, clients, and other decisionmakers. It involves the constant monitoring of satisfaction and changing preferences and the redefinition of the components of the tourism experience. Actions in this area include establishing quality standards, collecting and analyzing feedback concerning the quality of the tourism product, monitoring of prices at the destination, examining the different distribution channels, and managing the perceptions of the customers concerning the product. Additionally, the excellence program may also address more fundamental development objectives. These include looking after local entrepreneurs’ education needs, or other social-institutional capital needs of the community, in conjunction and with the support of the policies and actions established through the knowledge program.

Promotion/Communication Program. Within an increasingly competitive environment, destinations are striving to differentiate their products and communicate their positioning to potential tourists who have access to many different offers. In such a competitive and interconnected world, brand management and marketing and communication strategies become essential (Murdy, Pike & Lings, 2010). Potential tourists are able to access
information concerning the destination from different sources that include the mass and new digital media, the destination itself, travel agents, or exhibitions (Wang, Wu & Yuan, 2009). Thus, a deliberate strategy and a set of actions concerning the information to be disseminated about the destination become of prime importance. Such a communications strategy should be based on the strategic positioning that is identified in the White Paper, and which will need to be implemented on the basis of specific actions.

Tourism policy must respond to market challenges by designing new products and promoting the existing ones, in line with the strategy and positioning established in the White Paper. The promotion/communication program aims to optimize the processes of production, promotion, pricing, and distribution of tourism products and services, with a view to increasing the overall efficiency of capital at the destination. Here, the strategies that determine the positioning of the tourism product and the communication of this desired tourism positioning through traditional and new marketing communication instruments are established.

Innovation Program. While innovation is traditionally associated with technological advancement, in more recent times it has been viewed as a system that may also be applied to an entire region or a destination (McBeth, Carson & Northcote, 2004). A destination may obtain competitive advantage through the creation of systems of innovation that include the structures and institutions that facilitate creativity and technological enhancement. In addition, the ability to share and communicate innovative ideas is important. Carlsson and Stankiewicz (1991; as cited in McBeth et al., 2004) determine that the requirements for regional systems to be innovative include the capacity to fund ideas, critical mass, networks that facilitate communication, entrepreneurship, or the drive to innovate, and links between the public and private sectors.

Tourism destinations can also achieve competitive advantage through their innovation and capability of differentiating themselves through creativity and added value. Therefore, specific tourism policies can be directed toward creating a support system that encourages entrepreneurship and innovation. Specific aspects of this support structure should include sources of funding, communication networks, and systems for learning.

The innovation program aims to differentiate the tourism product by increasing the overall productivity of capital, introducing aspects which add value and increase competitiveness. In particular, the actions included under this heading relate to the improvement of the scientific and technological capacity at the destination (i.e., a combination of human, social, and physical
capital) as well as to increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the processes in the tourism system. Additionally, this program may be used to encourage the creation of innovative enterprises and entrepreneurial ventures. All in all, it deals with important challenges, such as achieving a culture of innovation and increasing the value added of the tourism products.

Governance Program. The concept of social-institutional capital has been discussed in depth in Chapter 2. It may be succinctly defined here as “those features of social organization, such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions” (Putnam, Leonardi & Nanetti, 1993; as cited in Onyx & Leonard, 2010, p. 381). Social-institutional capital is thought to play a critical role in achieving competitiveness and development of specific regions (Karlsson, Johansson & Stough, 2012). In particular, with the goal of development in mind, destinations need to pay specific attention to the networks, relationships, and institutions in their tourism system, since a participatory approach that encompasses different and diverse stakeholders is a sine-qua-non prerequisite for sustainable tourism that deals to a fairer distribution of the benefits derived.

As mentioned before, an essential aspect of tourism is its fragmented nature and the need to coordinate the views of very different stakeholders that have diverse interests. Therefore, coordination instruments are essential in order to achieve cohesion among its different agents. Generating mechanisms to achieve a participative approach, and achieving consensus regarding the meaning and the provision of tourism in the locality are part of the actions included in the governance program.

These actions overlap and support each other, while many of the policies that are instituted within the different programs can also impact other areas. All of the tools for actions discussed above constitute an attempt to plan and regulate tourism in a cohesive and systematic manner. However, as the literature reveals, not all destinations or institutional frameworks are alike. The challenge for the destination is to apply the steps mentioned in this chapter, while taking into consideration the specific situation and institutional framework of the destination. Thus, the system includes some flexibility, as each destination may determine the specific instruments to be used, based on its unique situation. The need for establishing specific actions and programs for coordination mentioned in the governance program does not withstand the requirement for an overall and comprehensive governance system that identifies the roles of different actors and institutions at the national, regional, and local level.
Governance and Implementation of Policies

In order to encourage the positive aspects of tourism and reduce negative impacts, it is generally thought that governmental intervention is necessary, since the market, left to itself, may not be able to prioritize public benefits over private gains. In tourism, environmental and cultural conservation, equal opportunities in employment, respect for the destination’s carrying capacity, poverty alleviation, and development, among others, are issues that may require a deliberate action and direct intervention through sectoral and transversal public policies. Schilner (2007) argues that in order to induce development, a deliberate state action and a transfer of land rights and skills, especially to the poor, are needed. Thus, knowledge and long-term training programs, together with government investment in infrastructure for tourism that specifically targets the poor, should be provided through government intervention (Schilner, 2007). In a similar vein, Bramwell (2011) determines that the promotion of sustainable tourism practices in a destination is more likely to be successful when there is an effective governance that primarily concerns the state. In his case study on the Magic Towns Program in Mexico (Chapter 10), Madrid Flores (2013) determines that a deliberate tourism governance that is based on the principles of sustainability and the amelioration of the local community’s living conditions can result in local development.

However, the coordination and participation of the private sector, as well as civil society, is important. This reflects a relational or network approach to policymaking that highlights the plurality of interest groups and the need to consider the tourism agents and their role within the system (Bramwell, 2011; Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Scott, 2011; Treuren & Lane, 2003). Thus, Rhodes (1996) portrays governance as the methods through which society is ruled, including the processes for resource allocation and coordination of the different actors in the system.

The fragmented nature of tourism requires the collaboration and coordination of different actors, but it also brings about the challenge to devise policies and a governance system that may cut across different areas and policy domains, such as transportation, employment, and environmental practices (Bramwell, 2011). Therefore, tourism policies that provide a balance between conservation of resources and development should also consider economic, social, and environmental issues (Bramwell, 2011; Hall, 2000b). Additionally, there is a need for coordination of different levels of action, including national, regional, and local.
Governance systems need to be tailored to the specific circumstances and political system that the destination is part of (Bramwell & Lane, 2011). These include the requirement of designing an appropriate institutional framework and devising a set of rules and instruments to achieve the objectives of sustainable tourism that leads to development and poverty alleviation. In particular, the extent to which tourism networks, as examples of a representative approach, may integrate different views and act to serve the collective interest of the community, rather than the individual self-interests, becomes a critical issue (Hall, 2011a). Additionally, the level of participation of the community in the governance system, and the way in which this participation takes place needs to be defined (Tosun, 2006).

Based on the cited literature, it is clear that destinations need to define first of all their governance systems as a model that identifies responsible bodies and actors at three different levels, national, regional, and local. This system must be adapted accordingly to the overall political system that the destination is part of, including the more centralized or decentralized approach prevalent in the country. However, even in more centralized political systems, such as those often present in developing countries, a local authority that is able to organize tourism at the destination is critical (de Bruyn & Fernández Alonso, 2012). The full coordination among institutions at various levels of governance and the balance among the priorities and interests of different institutions is a significant challenge. Additionally, the transversal character of tourism and its dependence and impact on other sectors requires collaboration and support in what de Bruyn and Fernández Alonso term “trans-governmental management” (2012, p. 228).

Furthermore, as already explained, an effective governance system needs to include mechanisms to encourage private–public partnerships and the creation of networks for collaboration. Tosun (2006) described different ways in which the community can be made to participate in the decision-making concerning tourism activities at the destination, including coercion, both induced and spontaneous. While it is generally accepted that bottom-up and spontaneous participation is more in line with the principles of sustainability (Tosun, 2001; Yüksel & Yüksel, 2000), the organization of tourism also needs to take into consideration the economic and political structure of the locality (Tosun, 2000).

Finally, an effective governance system needs to assign appropriate responsibilities to the different bodies and actors, both at the strategic and operational levels. At all levels of action, strategic goals and objectives, as well as operational instruments to achieve them, need to be defined. Additionally, coordination and monitoring should be identified as essential
functions of the governance system (de Bruyn & Fernández Alonso, 2012). Coordination requires the definition of the roles of the various actors and stakeholders, and the creation of networks. On the other hand, monitoring implies the establishment of performance indicators that ensure that the destination adapts to changing conditions in the external and internal environment. Within the principles of good governance, the deliberate consideration of the necessary balance between sustainability and development requires special attention to the destination’s social capital.

CONCLUSION

In line with the objective of bridging the gap between theory and practice, this chapter has discussed a model that considers the operational aspects of tourism policy formulation. In particular, the ultimate aim of tourism to contribute to the development of the destination is addressed from a more practical perspective, related to the conservation, provision, and increased performance of essential stocks of capital (natural, human, social, physical, and even financial). The model proposed aims to provide a coherent framework based on knowledge and a systematic analysis of the factors affecting tourism at the destination. The study proposes a methodology that starts with the preparation of a Green Paper aimed at identifying the relevant parties, in order to foment collaboration and participation of different stakeholders, at the local, regional, and national level. This document is aimed at defining the various responsibilities and functions of all interested parties, delineating the different areas for collaboration and establishing a participative process for the development of a tourism policy plan. The next step entails the analysis of the factors, attractors and support systems, together with the trends, through a White Paper that provides a framework for analysis. In this second phase, the strategic positioning of the destination is established. This document offers a roadmap for tourism policy and governance.

Once the conditions for the formulation and implementation of the Tourism Policy Plan are in place, the third phase establishes a set of programs, subprograms, and actions for the completion of the strategic objectives. Several programs that address priority areas of action are reviewed in this chapter. These standard programs address the need for a systematic treatment of tourism policies. Some of them, such as the knowledge or the excellence programs, contribute to the formation of human
and social-institutional capital, which is deemed essential from a tourism-for-development perspective. Others, like the sustainability, the innovation, or the promotion/communication programs, are concerned with the conservation of natural capital and with increasing both the stock and productivity of physical capital, as well as providing attractiveness to financial capital. Then, the need for measuring both the original ex-ante effects of tourism activities, as well as the ex-post feedbacks of policy, is covered by a state-of-the-art information and intelligence program with instruments such as the Tourism Satellite Account, the Input-Output Model, the Social Accounting Matrix, and the Computable General Equilibrium Model. Finally, all these standard-framework programs must be adapted to address different institutional realities, for which a wide-scope governance program must be launched from the onset of all tourism policy initiatives.

The model presented in this chapter addresses some of the issues and challenges of tourism. In recommending a broad, flexible program framework for policy, it aims to contribute to the development of the community at the destination. In particular, a strong emphasis is given to the idea of governance: the proactive participation of all different stakeholders and interested parties in inclusive institutions of tourism for development. The model ensures that all the relevant actors are identified and their functions, including their decisionmaking capabilities, are delineated. Thus, a network view is adopted, with a strong emphasis on the social-institutional as well as the human capital at the destination.
References

Acemoglu (Ed.).

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J.

Acosta, J.

Adams, W., Aveling, R., Brockington, D., Dickson, B., Elliott, J., Hutton, J., … Wolmer, W.

Adelman, I., & Morris, C.

Adler, P., & Kwon, S.

Agarwal, S.


Aghion, P., & Howitt, P.

Agrawal, A., & Gupta, K.

Ahn, B., Lee, B., & Shafer, C.
References

Airey, D., & Chong, K.

Alegre, J., Mateo, S., & Pou, L.

Alkire, S.

Alkire, S., & Foster, J.


Allens-Linklaters.

Alomes, S.

Alston, R.

Altés, C.

Amin, S.

Andereck, K., & Nyaupane, G.

Aramberri, J.

Arrow, K.


338 References


(2001). International data on educational attainment updates and implications. 

Baum, T., & Szivas, E. 
(2008). HRD in tourism: A role for government? 
*Tourism Management, 29*, 783–794.

Bauman, Z. 

Baumol, W., Litan, R., & Schramm, C. 

Beattie, P. 

Beck, U. 


Becker, E., Huselid, M., & Ulrich, D. 

Becker, G. 

Becker, G., Murphy, K., & Tamura, R. 

Benhabib, J., & Spiegel, M. 


Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. 

Berno, T., & Bricker, K. 
(2001). Sustainable tourism development: The long road from theory to practice. 


References


References

Cai, L.  

Calero, P.  

Campbel, C.  

Cañibano, C.  

Capanegra, C.  

Carlsen, J., & Jafari, J.  

Castellani, V., & Sala, S.  

Castro, D.  

Cater, E., & Lowman, G. (Eds.).  

CES.  

Çetinel, F., & Yolal, M.  

Chambers, E. (Ed.).  

Chang, H.  


References

de Kadt, E.

de Kadt, E. (Ed.).

De la Fuente, A., & Doménech, R.

Denison, E.


Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística (DANE).

Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT).

Department of Resources Energy and Tourism.

Department of Statistics.


Department of Tourism (DoT).


Diamond, J.

Dieke, P.
Dirección Provincial de Ordenamiento Urbano y Territorial.

Doğruel, F.
(2012). Bölgesel kalkınma ve kalkınma ajansları. Istanbul: TÜRKONFED.

Domar, E.

DPT (Devlet Planlama Teşkilati).

Dredge, D.

Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J.

Dredge, D., & Pforr, C.

Dritsakis, N.

Drucker, P.

Durbarry, R.
References

Durston, J.  
(2000). ¿Qué es el capital social comunitario. Serie políticas sociales, 38. Santiago de Chile: CEPAL.

Dwyer, L., & Kim, C.  

ECGI (European Corporate Governance Institute).  

Economic Strategies Committee.  

Edgell, D., Allen, M., Smith, G., & Swanson, J.  

EEAA (Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency).  

Eisner, R.  

Ekström, B.  

Emmanuel, A.  

European Commission.  

Eraqi, M.  

Erkuş-Oztürk, H.  

Ersoy, M.  
Escobar, A.

Esteve, R.

ETA (Egyptian Tourism Authority).

ETF (Egyptian Tourism Federation).

ETFHRDUNIT.

Eu-ssdp.

Euromonitor.

EuropeAid.

Farrell, B., & Twining-Ward, L.

Fayos-Sola, E.

Fayos-Solà, E., Fuentes, L., & Muñoz, A.
References


Fayos-Solà, E., García, P., & Moreda, A.


Fayos-Solà, E., & Jafari, J. (Eds.).


Fayos-Solà, E., Muñoz, A., & Fuentes, L.


Fayos-Solà, E., & Pedro, A.


Fayos-Solà, E., Ruhanen, L., de Bruyn, C., Muñoz, A., Fuentes, L., & Fernández, A.


Felsenstein, D., & Fleischer, A.


Figueredo, R., & Rozo, E.


Financial Times.


Finnish Tourism Board.


Font, X.


Fontana, F.

References


References


Fukuyama, F.
Future Brand.
Fyall, A., Oakley, B., & Weiss, A.
(2000). Theoretical perspectives applied to inter-organisational collaboration on Britain’s inland waterways. Hospitality Tourism Administration, 1, 89–112.
Gainsborough, M.
Gardela, R., & Aguayo, E.
George, S.
Giddens, A.
Giménez, G., López-Puyo, C., & Jaime, S.
Glaeser, E.
Go, F., & Govers, R.
Go, F., & Trunfio, M.
(2012). A paradigm shift from tourism destination management to democratic
governance of place branding. Journal of Tourism and Travel Research,
12, 4–17.

González, A.
(2006). Urbanismo y crecimiento turístico en Lanzarote durante la segunda
mitad del siglo XX. Papeles de Geografía, 44, 39–57.

González, A., & Hernández, J.
de Tenerife.

de Tenerife.

Gordon, P.

Government Monitor.

Goymen, K.
1025–1048.

Granovetter, M.

The economic sociology of immigration: Essays on networks, ethnicity, and

Grant, J.
Development Council.

Gray, C.
(2009). Rural out-migration and smallholder agriculture in the Southern

Green Star Hotel.

Griffin, C.
(2005). The imperative of regional governance: Securing the tourism sector and

Grönroos, C.

Grootaert, C., & van Bastelaer, T.
(2002). Understanding and measuring social capital: A multi-disciplinary tool for


References


James, J.  

James, P., & Courtenay, J.  

Jeffries, I.  

Jenkins, J.  

Jensen, R.  

Jiménez, A.  

Johnson, R., Onwuegbuzie, A., & Turner, L.  

Jorgenson, D., & Fraumeni, B.  

Jorgenson, D., & Fraumeni, B.  

Kakwani, N., & Silber, J.  

Karlsson, C., Johansson, B., & Stough, R.  

Kasimis, C., Papadopoulos, A., & Pappas, C.  
Katircioglu, S.
Keech, M.
Keller, P.
Kelliher, F., Foley, A., & Frampton, A.
Kendrick, J.
Kerr, G.
Keyman, F.
Khan, H., Chou, F., & Wong, K.
Kim, H., Chen, M., & Jang, S.
Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M.
Klein, N.
Klijn, E.
References

Knack, S.

Knebel, J.

Ko, T.

Kokko, A.


Kong, L.


Konu, H., Tuohino, A., & Björk, P.
(2011). Wellbeing tourism in Finland. Finland as a competitive wellbeing tourism destination. Savonlinna: University of Eastern Finland.

Kotler, P., & Gerner, D.

Kozak, M., & Martin, D.

Krugman, P.

Kumar, A.

Kuper, D., Ramírez, L., & Troncoso, C.

Kuzey Anadolu Kalkınma Ajansı.
References


Lee, C., & Chang, C.  

Lee, C.  

Lee, H.  

Lee, K., Matthews, J., & Wade, R.  

Leff, E.  

Leiper, N.  

Lejárraga, I., & Walkenhorst, P.  

Lewis, P.  

Lewis, W.  

Lillo, A., Ramón, A., & Sevilla, M.  

Lin, N.  

Liu, A., & Wall, G.  

Loewendahl-Ertugal, E.  
References


Merriam Webster.


Meyer, K., Tran, Y., & Nguyen, H.


MGI (McKinsey Global Institute).


Mill, R., & Morrison, A.


Mincer, J.


Ministerio de Comercio, Industria y Turismo, Viceministerio de Turismo y Departamento Nacional de Planeación.


Ministerio de Economía de la Provincia de Buenos Aires.


Ministerio de Cultura.


Ministry of Culture and Tourism.


Ministry of Development.


MINTUR Ministerio de Turismo de la Nación.


Miossec, J.


MITA.

MITA and STPB.

Mitchell, R., Wooliscroft, B., & Higham, J.

MND.

Morgan, D.

Mossberg, L.

MOT (Ministry of Tourism).

MTI.

Muhanna, E.

Murdy, S., Pike, S., & Lings, I.
Murphy, P., & Price, G.  

Murray, G.  

Muñoz, A.  

Myrdal, G.  

Narayan, D., & Pritchett, L.  

Navarro, F., Schlueter, R., & Adriani, H.  

Nehru, V., Swanson, E., & Dubey, A.  

Neira, I.  

Nelson, F.  

Nelson, R., & Phelps, E.  

Ngamsangchaikit, W.  


Office of National Tourism.


OMT.

(2001b). Modelo FAS. Documento interno de trabajo. Research group DMS.


References


Ovgun, B.

Oxfam.

Oxfam Australia.

Paldham, M., & Svendsen, G.

Palmer, A.

Paulovich, K.

Pearce, D.

Pearce, L.

Pechlaner, H.

Peltoniemi, M.

Peña, D.
Pennington-Gray, L., & Holdnak, A.  

PEPBA.  

Pérez, F., Montesinos, V., Serrano, L., & Fernández, J.  

Pérez-Ducy de Cuella, E.  

Pe´ rez, F., Montesinos, V., Serrano, L., & Ferna´ ndez, J.  

Pforr, C.  

Pham, D.  

Pham, M., & Vunakan, Q.  

Piglia, M.  

Pike, S.  

Pikkemaat, B., & Weiermair, K.  

Pine, J., & Gilmore, J.  
References

Place, S.  

Plog, S.  

Portela, M., & Neira, I.  

Porter, M.  

Potts, T., Backman, K., Uysal, M., & Backman, S.  

Prahalad, C., & Ramaswamy, V.  

Prats, F., & Manchón, F.  

Presenza, A.  

Psacharopoulos, G., & Arriagada, A.  

Putnam, R.  

Putnam, R., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R.  

Queensland Government Department of Employment and Training.  


References


References


380 References

Tan, E., Yeoh, B., & Teo, P.  

Tao, T., & Wall, G.  

Taylor, J., & Hunter, B.  

TDA (Tourism Development Authority).  


Teijeiro, M., García, M., & Maríz, R.  

Telfer, D.  

Telfer, D., & Sharpley, R.  

Temple, J., & Johnson, P.  

Teo, P., & Chang, T.  

The Economist.  

Thomas, R., & Thomas, H.  

TI (Transparency International).  

Torres Strait Regional Authority.  
References 381


References

Trakya Kalkınma Ajansı.

Travel and Relax project plan.

Treuren, G., & Lane, D.

Treutler, T., & King, J.

Trousdale, W.

Trout, J.

Turkish Government.

Türkiye Tarih Vakfı.

Turner, L.

UK.
UMP.

UNDP.

Unger, J., Rauch, A., & Freire, M.

UNWTO.

URA.

URAK (Uluslararası Rekabet Araştırmaları Kurumu).
References


References

Virtanen, E.  

VNAT (Vietnam National Administration of Tourism).  

VOV (The Voice of Vietnam Radio).  

Vuong, Q.  

Wahab, S., & Pigram J. (Eds.).  

Wallingre, N.  

Wang, Y., & Davidson, M.  

Wang, Y., Wu, C., & Yuan, J.  

Wanhill, S.  

WCED.  

WDA.  

Weaver, D.  

Weintraub, E.  
References

Weiss, T.  

Wildlife Reserves.  

Williamson, J.  

Wolfensohn, J.  

Woolcock, M.  

Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D.  

World Bank.  


World Bank Group.  

World Commission on Environment and Development.  

World Economic Forum.  


World Economic Forum (WEF).  
References


World Tourism Organization.

WTO.

WTTC (World Travel & Tourism Council).


Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J.

Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B., & Yuksel, A.

Yuksel, F., & Yuksel, A.
(2000). Decentralized tourism administration: Is it the way forward? In First International Joint Symposium on Business Administration: Challenges for Business Administrators in the New Millennium. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University and Silesian University, Çanakkale, Turkey.

Yusif, S., & Nabeshima, K.

Zaazou, H.


Zahra, A.

Zapata, C.
References

