A REVIEW OF MARKETING IDEAS WITHIN THE EVOLUTION OF TOURISM PLANNING THOUGHT

Jutamas Wisansing

Abstract

Marketing techniques were valued and used dominantly in the early tourism planning. Over the years, however, tourism has grown in both scale and extent. With this growth, academics and environmental critics alike have shown numerous cases and instances, whereby communities, societies, and their welfare have been compromised for economic growth. Such an uneven consideration is believed to be supported by ill-equipped marketing strategies. In order to further develop a more responsible marketing approach, it is important to trace how marketing and planning have emerged within the context of tourism development. The objective of this article, therefore, will provide an overview of contemporary perspectives and issues in tourism planning. An understanding of these broad concepts and their evolution serves as a precursor to an examination of the relationship between planning and marketing of a destination area. Key underlying factors that have resulted in some profound changes to tourism planning and how new forms of tourism (in contrast to mass tourism) have emerged will be outlined.

INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades tourism has emerged as one of the world's major industries. It is exceeding the importance of many manufacturing sectors and other services in terms of sales, employment and foreign currency earnings. Along with the growth of the tourism industry, there has been an increasing debate about the negative effects of unplanned tourism development and the haphazard approach to mass tourism, particularly in developing countries (Ryan, 1991, March, 1994). Factors such as cultural denigration, loss of traditional pride and ethnic identity as well as environmental

---

*Dr. Jutamas Wisansing holds a Ph.D in Tourism Planning and Marketing from Lincoln University, New Zealand. Currently she is teaching tourism and hospitality subjects at the Graduate School of Tourism Management, Assumption University.

degradation are reported (Haywood, 1990, Choy, 1991). Tourism scholars have increasingly been addressing and resolving these negative issues by questioning the industry's dynamics, the development processes engendered and their consequences for destination areas and local people (Ryan, 1991, March, 1994, Buhalis, 2000).

In the late 80s, the concept of sustainable development has come to predominantly represent and encompass a set of tourism principles and management methods for the conservation of "tourism product(s)". Its core orientation diverges considerably from traditional *'boosterism'*, which was widely advocated in early 1960s and 1970s. Overtime, conventional tourism planning and development has shifted from a narrow focus on physical or promotional planning facilitating the growth of tourism to a more integrated approach recognising the needs and views of not only developers but also the host community (Getz, 1987). Tourism scholars assert that overemphasising on such a 'marketing approach' to tourism planning is short-sighted (Ryan, 1991, March, 1994). Haywood (1990), Choy (1991), Ryan (1991), March (1994), and Buhalis (2000) are among those who have provided a constructive critique upon the *parasitic* relationship between marketing and tourism. Haywood (1990) summarises their concerns,

"...it is vital that we examine the premises and presumption that underlies marketing activity. This examination is necessary because many marketers are neglecting issues central to the outcome of touristic activities, namely satisfaction and harmonious relationships"(p. 195).

The key criticism about contemporary tourism marketing practice is that it has not yet addressed fully and adequately socio-cultural and environmental sensitivity particularly at the community level (King et al., 2000). It is at this level that both positive and negative impacts are most acute. From a pure marketing perspective, fundamental question, who are the consumers of tourism? remains debatable. Whilst tourism scholars have in recent years paid much attention to advancing approach to tourism planning, a more advanced form of tourism marketing appears to be in its infancy, lacking in practical application. This article will provide an overview of contemporary perspectives and issues in tourism planning. An understanding of these broad concepts and their evolution serves as a precursor to an examination of the relationship between planning and marketing of a destination area. Key underlying factors that have resulted in some profound changes to tourism planning and how new forms of tourism (in contrast to mass tourism) have emerged will be outlined.

THE EVOLUTION OF TOURISM PLANNING THOUGHT

Despite the fact that there were different terms used to capture the evolution of tourism studies and planning approaches, similar themes emerge (as shown in table 1 and discussed in detail in the following sections).

Table 1: Traditions of Tourism Planning Thought
After Getz (1987) and Jafari (1990)

Getz	Planning Focus	Jafari
Boosterism	**How many tourists can be attracted and accommodated?** **Promotional campaign**	Advocacy
Tourism as an industry (Economic Approach)	**Can Tourism be used as an economic growth?** **Maximising income and employment** **Tourism's importance to the economy**	Advocacy
Physical/Spatial	**Carrying capacity** **Managing Tourism impacts** **Resource-based evaluation**	Cautionary
Community-based	**'Better' forms of tourism: soft tourism, ecotourism** **Need for local control** **Understanding community impacts** **Responsive to host communities**	Adaptancy
Integrative approach	**Understanding the tourism system** **Evaluative research**	Knowledge-based

Getz (ibid.) made it clear that these traditions of tourism planning are not mutually exclusive, nor they are necessarily sequential. Jafari (ibid.) also points out that all platforms have emerged without replacing one another, hence all four platforms exist today. In retrospect, both authors indicate consistently that tourism planning (if undertaken at all) was in the past seen as a simplistic process focused simply on encouraging mass tourism. This simplistic form of tourism planning, however, only began in 1960s when the growth of tourism businesses has been recognised gradually as a significant industry (Burns, 1999). This period was seen as a boom time of tourism development.

Boosterism: more is better

A *'boosterism'* approach to tourism planning prevailed throughout 1960s and early 1970s (Hall, Jenkins and Kearsley, 1997). This 'growth-oriented strategy' employed different promotional strategies as dominant marketing tools to increase visitation. This is reflected in public and private tourism organisations spending virtually all of their budgets on promotion (WTO, 1979, Pearce, 1992). Thus, it appears that marketing strategies centred simply on promotional campaigns which were regarded as the significant tourism planning concern. Getz (1987) observed that, "tourism planning has evolved over this period (since the Second World War), with an explosion of economic and marketing ideas coming to dominant tourism planning" (p.7). However it should be noted that the so-called marketing ideas were asymmetrical in the sense that its focuses and techniques were mainly on one 'P' - promotion. It can therefore be concluded that marketing ideas used during this period were narrow and unsophisticated. The focal belief

was simply that tourism is good therefore 'the more is the better'. In fact, Getz (ibid.) contends that boosterism is not really planning at all.

Economic Approach

Gradually, the economic significance of tourism was ranked highly by many nations. Tourism-related industries become a prevalent means to promote economic gains. Many nations and destinations have succeeded in rapidly reaching their targeted number of visitors. Positive consequences of tourism development were evident in the considerable generation of employment and increased foreign exchange earnings. Marketing is also the primary tool of this economic approach.

Today, marketing techniques remain dominant as a tourism planning tool (Tosun and Jenkins, 1998). As time progressed, the marketing techniques used however have become more complicated, including considerations and understandings about tourist behaviour, segmentation, and consumer choice theory. Evidence of positive economic impacts can be seen in the numbers of earlier articles and texts, to a large extent, devoted to the economic analysis of tourism (See for example, Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Hughes 1994,). Concepts such as multipliers and input-output models have been introduced and advanced. This line of thought was aimed at finding the best measurement of what exactly tourism can contribute, or in fact has contributed, to the economic development of a destination.

Positive consequences of tourism also noted at this time. Jafari (ibid.) explains that '…the Advocacy platform (also) emphasises the noneconomic attributes: that tourism preserves the natural and man-made environments; that it revives traditions of the past; and that it actively promotes cultural performances' (p.34). These arguments from the tourism advocates were convincing, hence strengthening the support of tourism development and its promotional campaigns.

However, as tourism development proceeded, during the 1970s an uneven distribution of benefits, and recognition of tourism's negative impacts became more evident. Consequences of unbalanced or haphazard tourism planning and development have brought a hard lesson for several places where social and environmental impacts were severe (Hills and Lundgren, 1977). Tourism scholars started to question the 'growth paradigm' and clearly voiced a multitude of negative impacts of mass tourism. Jafari (1990) refers to this school of thought as a 'cautionary perspective'. The physical/spatial planning tradition, coined by Getz (1987), falls into this perspective. One of its main concerns was to highlight the negative impacts of tourism in relation to the host community. As a result of this, the *boosterism* belief has been increasingly discredited and tourism practitioners have gradually undertaken a more cautionary approach. From this point, it became apparent that the orientation and techniques of marketing and tourism planning started to diverge. This unbalanced form of planning (or tourism promotion) nonetheless remains to date as a dominant planning approach in many places.

Tourism Impacts: A cautionary perspective

Several studies pertaining to this school of thought were directed at defining stages and models of tourism development. These studies address the relationships between tourism development and host communities. Core works of this school of thought include:

♦ Doxey (1975) proposed an irritation index or 'irridex' which uses to assess host-guest interactions and relationships. The model consists of 4 steps: (a) euphoria (delight in contact); (b) apathy (increasing indifference with larger numbers); (c) irritation (concern and annoyance over price rises, crime, rudeness, cultural rules being broken); and (d) antagonism (covert and overt aggressive to visitors).

♦ Smith (1978) proposed seven categories of tourists (Explorer, Elite, Offbeat, Unusual, Incipient mass, Mass and Charter). While "Explorer" is at one end of the spectrum argued on having the least impact on the community, "Charter" tourists connoting massive arrivals is at the other end, having a substantial impact particularly on cross-cultural contact issues.

♦ Butler (1980) offered a model to explain the evolution of tourist areas. Tourist destinations are seen to evolve through the stages of exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, and then either decline or rejuvenation. The emergence of social impacts on host communities becomes more significant when the development reaches the consolidation stage.

Alongside these studies, the last two decades, has witnessed a burgeoning number of studies focusing on the negative impacts, specifically dealing with the impacts of tourism development on environmental quality, socio-cultural and economic outcomes (e.g. Cohen 1978, Pigram 1980, Liu and Var 1986, Prentice, Witt, and Wydenbach 1994). In aggregate, their views have been called the 'cautionary' perspective (Jafari, 1990). In the above works, observations and measurements clearly suggested that positive and negative impacts on local communities were linked closely to the expansion of tourism. As tourism development has proceeded, both the positive and negative impacts become more and more apparent. A central tourism-planning debate focusing on how the positive impacts might be maximised and the negative community impacts are minimised or mitigated.

The evolution of a destination life cycle model (Butler, 1980) provides a significant conceptualisation in indicating the dynamism of destination areas that both marketers and planners have made use of in their planning and marketing considerations. However, in the language of marketing, the focal point is still on how to overcome obstacles to growth. At the same time, tourism planning literature is concerned not just in terms of how to prolong the destination's *growth* stage, but also related to the evaluation of tourism resources in order to identify desirable rates and acceptable forms of change in the environment, and in local residents' perception of tourism development. This re-evaluation of tourism's relationship with host communities represents considerable challenges to the tourism industry and tourism planners and has led to a strong call for a more integrated planning approach and the need to incorporate other issues into the planning consideration. These include such issues as carrying capacity (Williams and Gill, 1994), destination life cycle (Butler, 1980), spatial patterns and processes (Pearce, 1987), to list but a few.

Alternative Forms of Tourism: Adaptancy platform

As a result of the recognition of increased negative community impacts, tourism advocates

call for an 'alternative' form of tourism which needs to be a *better* kind of tourism that has the potential to solve the problems and negative impacts associated with 'conventional' mass tourism. Wheller (1991) uses the term 'responsible tourism'. Other writers speak of eco-tourism (Boo, 1990), soft tourism (Krippendorf, 1982), green tourism (Bramwell, 1991), and appropriate tourism (Singh et al., 1989). The nuances of these terms and concepts have been fiercely contested. Thus it is important not to label all these differing terms into one category. In spite of that, it is arguable that the key objectives and rationale underpinning these many different terms have been similar. According to Godfrey (1996) they can be classified into two broad schools of thought.

1. The Product Approach –planning new sustainable 'products'-

Several tourism scholars view the 'new and better' form of tourism planning as a *replacement* of a conventional mass tourism with new (good) green products. In this sense, a clear distinction is made between two polar opposites such as mass institutionalised tourism on the one hand and 'alternative' tourism on the other. In essence, Wheeler (1991:92) sums up the key figures of this new/good/green product type,

'the traveller is preferred to the tourist, the individual to the group, the independent specialist operators are more acceptable than large firms, indigenous homely accommodation is preferred to multinational hotel chains etc – basically 'small' versus 'mass'.

According to this line of thinking, alternative or appropriate tourism should therefore embrace small-scale, steady, controlled development.

2. The Industry Approach -planning for a more sustainable 'industry' as a whole

In contrast to the product approach, Godfrey (1996:61) explains that "mass tourism is inevitable due to sheer tourism demand, and what is needed is a way to make *all* tourism more sustainable". The advocates of this approach indicate that viewing a new form of tourism planning as a replacement for the existing market-led approach fails to address the real problems created by mass tourism (Butler, 1989, Wheeler, 1991). In essence, it implies that a new and better planning approach should therefore provide a better mechanism for *all* forms of tourism to become more responsible and sustainable, including a large-scale tourism development. Godfrey further suggests that planning for sustainable tourism requires development to take place within the context of local socio-economic development, and should incorporate all aspects of community well being. Acknowledgement of these issues has highlighted the need for a comprehensive and coordinated goal-setting framework, which has the 'host community' as a central focus of tourism planning.

Researchers in the field (for instance, Gunn, 1994, Inskeep, 1991) made it clear that a "better" tourism planning approach should constitute benefits for all aspects of community; including sociological (e.g., promotion of community stability, family solidarity, cultural identity), economic (e.g., employment, income), environmental (e.g., conservation/preservation). It is argued that the community will benefit more from tourism development if the community members participate fully both in making

decisions that affect their welfare and in implementing these decisions. Therefore, the community based planning process requires involvement of local residents and decision-makers at each step in the process. This manifests a significant shift of tourism planning from being centralised (a top-down approach) to being decentralised (a bottom-up approach).

The Community Approach: Comprehensive and coordinated goal-setting framework

Academic concern about host-guest relations in tourism began highlighting the negative impacts of tourism on host communities. This cautionary perspective emerged with a call for a tourism planning approach which could advance our understanding on what can be done to predict and alleviate these negative consequences. This awakening was accelerated simultaneously in response to the concept of 'sustainable development' (WCED, 1987).

In the tourism field, community based tourism planning has come to the forefront and received substantial attention and advocacy by scholars (for example; Murphy 1985, Gunn 1988, Haywood 1988, Blank 1989, Simmons 1994, Jamal and Getz, 1995, Reed 1997, Timothy, 1999). The main principle of this approach is a quest for community inputs through their active participation in tourism development processes. According to Smith (1978), the mobilisation of community in this way not only fosters improvements in host-guest relationships but also strengthens human and community bonds, which will result in socio-cultural harmony. Therefore, the community should be consulted and they also should be constantly informed. Simmons (1994:1) explains that,

"There are two reasons for this. First, the impacts of tourism are felt most keenly at the local destination area and, second, community residents are being recognised as an essential ingredient in the 'hospitality atmosphere' of a destination" (emphasis added).

In line with Simmons' rationale, the most often-quoted works of both Murphy (1985) and Krippendorf (1987) argue for a community-based approach that involves host communities directly in tourism planning. To Murphy (1985: 165), residents' input is required because "the industry uses the community as a resource, sells it as a product, and in the process affects the lives of everyone". In other words, tourism draws extensively from community's resources therefore tourism must not merely *exploit* resources for its own benefit without considering what can be reciprocated to the community.

Integrative Approach - knowledge based platform

Both Getz (1987) and Jafari (1990) offer comparable guidelines for tourism planners. Jafari (ibid.) states 'the new platform aims at positioning itself on a scientific foundation and, at the same time, maintaining bridges with other platforms…the goal is to form a scientific body of knowledge on tourism' (p.5). Similarly, the integrative approach to planning offered by Getz (ibid.) places an emphasis upon an understanding of the whole tourism system based on a rigorous evaluative research. Goals for tourism should therefore be derived from, and integrated into, overall community aspirations. According to Getz (ibid), the planning approach should constitute four key elements:

- Goal oriented- with clear recognition of the role to be played by tourism in achieving broad societal goals;
- Systematic- drawing on research to provide conceptual and predictive support for planners, and drawing on the evaluation of planning efforts to develop theory;
- Democratic- with full and meaningful citizen input from the community level up;
- Integrative- placing tourism planning issues into the mainstream of planning for parks, heritage, conservation, land use and the economy.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

A significant implication drawn from the review of the evolution of tourism planning thought is that during the boom time the tradition of tourism planning focused dominantly on marketing techniques with an overemphasis upon promotion. At this nascent stage, tourism development and promotion were supported fully, as the positive consequences from such actions were apparent and valued highly. At this time the relationship between marketing and tourism planning was overlapping. It is arguable that from a practical viewpoint the term 'marketing or planning' a destination was viewed and used interchangeably.

However, the realisation of the dynamic and evolutionary nature of tourism (Butler, 1980) revealed foreseeable negative impacts inherent with tourism growth, particularly to the host community. Academics concerned with these issues and tensions have advocated for more integrated form of planning. The underpinning goal focuses on how to maximise the positive impacts while abating negative impacts. The above literature indicates that it is generally agreed that tourism planning should place community in the centre of development and take their wellbeing critically into planning consideration. Additionally, it should be noted that community participation is also considered to be an end in its own right, as valuable *per se*. Therefore encouraging community participation in tourism planning and development should at least be interpreted as a more democratic way of working.

Marketing was in the past and will inevitably remain a significant set of techniques used by tourism planners. It is therefore surprising to find a 'missing link' between tourism marketing theories and tourism planning. While the participatory and integrative planning approach is being advanced and accepted as a 'better' form of tourism planning, the literature review showed clearly that tourism marketing is lagging behind, still advocating its once conventional development wisdom - *boosterism*. In other words, broad marketing techniques applied to tourism planning appear to be in its infancy. From a practical perspective, too often, local leaders and businesses, with the assistance of state tourism agencies, march forward with promotional strategies to attract visitors to their destination areas with little concern and/or effort placed on the impacts these visitors will create. Take, for instance, the efforts in tourism planning and/or marketing offered by National Tourism Organisations (NTOs) in Asia. Of the 100% allocation funds spent annually, over 90% go directly into so-called marketing strategies, which overly emphasise promotional activities (WTO, 1996). Haywood (1990), Choy (1991), Ryan (1991), March (1994), Hall (1999), Buhalis (2000) all hold concern for the overemphasis of promotional aspects within tourism marketing.

The promotional approach, as Buhalis (2000, p.98) asserts, 'fails to recognise the unique needs and limitations of each destination as well as their particular geographical, environmental and socio-cultural characteristics'. Elsewhere, Payne and Dimanche (1996) observed, tourism development is too often planned and marketed without consideration of the local environments or community's needs and wants. In this context, it can be argued that tourism marketing has functioned *primarily for the benefit of the tourist* and its form and dynamics have principally been driven by the industry itself. Meanwhile, the local community has found themselves excluded from the decision making process, and from full and active participation in the growth of tourism in their localities. The potential to improve quality of life and provide the broadest range of benefits to community is compromised by the profit-driven goals and objectives of tourism organisations and to a large extent by the nation economic development agenda. The prospect of marketing within tourism planning, particularly the community-based approach needs to be examined.

DIRECTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Whilst generic marketing theories have been well tested in a range of commercial situations, *a lack of* researches to advance our understanding of tourism marketing may, to a certain extent, result in the existing misunderstandings, fallacies and malpractice. Earlier observation is consistent with a later debate relating to firms within the tourism industry whereby Calantone and Mazanec (1991) explain the paucity and underutilisation of marketing as a 'management discipline' in tourism. Unlike the rapid growth of many large-scale commercial service operations, tourism scholars observed that the tourism industry has been slow to apply the broader principles of marketing theory. According to Calantone and Mazanec (ibid), tourism in fact is one of the last industries to experience the change from a sellers' to a buyers' market.

Ryan (1991) concludes that "marketing has been interpreted narrowly as being concerned with advertising and promotion and possibly to some extent with price…" (p. 104). Similarly, March (1994) has indicated that marketing's contribution to tourism has been dismal. March added, "when the issue of marketing has been raised in the academic tourism literature the term is usually narrowly defined or corrupted" (p.412). Furthermore, March (1994) contends that the adoption of marketing principles within the tourism industry, compared with other service industries, has been undervalued and misrepresented by tourism policy makers and practitioners alike.

Trends in marketing are moving toward a more integrated and sustainable approach (Ruddy and Flanagan, 2000). This interest has led to an increased research on social responsibility, marketing and quality-of-life, marketing ethics, green or environmental marketing, which alert organisations to be more responsible for the well being of the society at large. The key concept of this discussion starts from the necessity of *combining* profit making for any organisation with sustainable environmental management and social quality for society at large. An examination of the above proposed combination is critical and more challenging to tourism marketing simply because the nature and scope of tourism industry *per se* does not limit itself to the participants in a business transaction, service providers, and consumers. The industry's operations inevitably affect all of society. A very

significant component of the resources exploited by the tourism industry is, in fact, drawn from public goods (e.g. beaches, natural parks).

Negative outcomes and consequences from tourism development indicate that market mechanisms alone are not sufficient to manage the industry responsibly. Middleton (1997) indicates that to achieve responsible marketing, the issue of regulation versus self-regulation need to be addressed and urgently call for more research. The literature review indicates further that a balance between tourism and the environment – social, cultural and especially physical – would never be achieved solely through market forces (Choy, 1991), or even through self-regulation concepts such as green marketing and socially responsible programmes. From a business perspective, strong competitive and profit-driven market forces tend to hinder self-regulatory methods. The extraordinary complexity of the tourism industry as well as the predominance of small businesses involved in it has also been reported as other impediments. For these reasons, several authors advocate that regulation is required if a more responsible tourism marketing and planning is to be implemented successfully (Middleton, 1997, Tregear et al., 1997, Tonner, 2000). However, this issue remains to be determined.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

One important conclusion drawn from the literature reviewed is that marketing and/or market planning is a subject about which we know relatively little in tourism despite the plethora of calls for more research related to the topic. Although market planning has been recognised as an integral part of the overall tourism planning process, relatively few *empirical* studies have been undertaken on the

details of marketing planning and its execution particularly within community based planning approach and 'responsible' forms of tourism. Despite increasing social concern about and the call for more community participation, research dealing with these issues is limited.

REFERENCES

Blank, U. (1989) *The Community Tourism Imperative; The Necessity, the Opportunities, its Potential*. State College TX: Venture Publishing.

Boo, E. (1990) *Ecotourism: Potential or Pitfalls*. Washington, D.C.: World Wildlife Fund.

Bramwell, B. (1991) "Sustainability and Rural Tourism Policy in Britain", *Tourism Recreation Research*, 16(2), 49-51.

Buhalis D. (2000) "Marketing the Competitive Destination of the Future", *Tourism Management*, 21, 97-116.

Butler, R.W. (1980) "The Concept of a Tourism Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for management of Resources", *Canadian Geographer*, 24, 5-12. (1989)

_____ Alternative Tourism: Pious Hope or Trojan Horse?, *World Leisure and Recreation*, Winter, 9-17.

Burns P. (1999) "Paradoxes in Planning Tourism Elitism or Brutalism?", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 329-348.

Calantone, R.J., and MaZanec, J.A. (1991) "Marketing Management and Tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(1), 101-119.

Choy D.L (1991) "Tourism Planning: The Case for Market Failure", *Tourism Management*, 12 (4), 313-330.

Cohen, E. (1978) "The Impacts of Tourism on the Physical Environment", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5, 215-237.

Doxey, G.V. (1975) "A Causation Theory of Visitor-Resident Irritants, Methodology and Research Inferences" The Impact of Tourism, *Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings of the Travel Research Association*, San Diego, 195-198.

Godgrey K. (1996) "Towards Sustainability? Tourism in The Republic of Cyprus" *In Practicing Responsible Tourism International Case Studies in Tourism Planning, Policy, and Development.* Edited by Harrison L. C and Husbands. Ryerson Polytechnic University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Getz, D. (1987) "Tourism Planning and Research: Traditions, Models and Futures", *Paper presented* at Australian Travel Research Workshop, Bunbury, Western Australia, November 5-6.

Gunn, C. (1994) *Tourism Planning*. 3rd ed. London: Taylor and Francis.

Gunn, C. (1988) *Tourism Planning*, 2nd ed. London: Taylor and Francis.

Haywood K.M. (1990) "Revising and Implementing the Marketing Concept as It Applies to Tourism", *Tourism Management*, September, 195-205.

_____. (1988) "Responsible and Responsive Planning in the Community", *Tourism Management*, 9, 105-118.

Inskeep, E. (1991) *Tourism Planning. An integrated and sustainable development approach.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Jafari, J. (1990) "Research and Scholarship: The Basis of Tourism Education", *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1(1): 33-41.

Jamal, T.B. and Getz D. (1995) "Collaboration Theory and Community Tourism Planning", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22, 186-204.

King B., McVey M., and Simmons D. (2000) "A Societal Marketing Approach to National Tourism Planning: Evidence from the South Pacific", *Tourism Management*, 21, 407-416.

Krippendorf, J. (1987*) The Holiday Makers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel.* London: William Heinemann.

_____. (1982) "Towards New Tourism Policies: The Importance of Environmental and Socio-Cultural Factors", *Tourism Management,* 3(3), 135-148.

Liu, J.C. and T. Var. 1986 "Resident Attitudes toward Tourism Impacts in Hawaii" *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, 193-214

Madrigal, R. (1993) "A Tale of Tourism in Two Cities" *Annals of Tourism Research,* 20, 336-353.

March, R. (1994) "Tourism Marketing Myopia", *Tourism Management*, Vol.15 (6), 411-415.

Mathieson, A., and G. Wall (1982) *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts.* Harlow: Longman Scientific and Technical.

Middleton, V.T.C. (1997) "Sustainable Tourism: A Marketing Perspective", *In Tourism Sustainability Principles to Practice,* Edited by Stabler M.J.: Cab International.

Murphy, P. (1985) *Tourism: A Community Approach.* New York: Methuen.

Pearce, D. (1992) Tourist Organisations, Longman Scientific & Technical.

Pearce D.G. (1987) "Spatial Patterns of Package Tourism in Europe", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(2), 183-201.

Pigram, J.J (1980) "Environmental implications of Tourism Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7, 554-583.

Prentice, R.C., S.F. Witt, and E.G. Wydenbach. 1994 "The Endearment behaviour of tourists through their interaction with the host community", *Tourism Management*, 15(2),117-125.

Reed M.G. (1997) "Power Relations and Community-Based Tourism Planning", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24 (3), 566-591.

Ruddy J. and Flanagan S. (2000) *Tourism Destination Marketing Gaining the Competitive Edge,* Published by Tourism Research Centre, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland.

Ryan, C. (1991) "Tourism and Marketing – a Symbiotic Relationship", *Tourism Management,* 12 (2), 101-111.

Simmons, D.G. (1994) "Community participation in Tourism Planning", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 15 (2), 98-108.

Singh, T.V, Theuns H.L. and Go F.M. (1989) *Towards Appropriate Tourism: The Case of Developing Countries.* European University Studies, Series X, Vol. 11, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Smith, V.L (1978) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Timothy D.J, (1999) "Participatory Planning A View of Tourism in Indonesia", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 26 (2), 371-391.

Tonner K. (2000) "Consumer Protection and Environmental Protection: Contradictions and Suggested Steps towards Integration", *Journal of Consumer Policy*, Vol. 23, 63-78.

Tosun C. (2000) "Limits to Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process in Developing Countries", *Tourism Management*, 21, 613-633.

Tregear A., McLeay F. and Moxey A. (1997) "Sustainability and Tourism Marketing: Competitive or Complementary?" *In Tourism Sustainability Principles to Practice* Edited by Stabler M.J.: Cab International.

Wheeller, B. (1991) "Tourism's Troubled Times: Responsible Tourism is not the Answer", *Tourism Management*, 12 (June), 91-96.

Williams, P.W. and Gill A. (1994) Tourism Carrying capacity Management Issues. In Theobald (ed.), Global Tourism: The Next Decade. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 174-187.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987) *Our Common Future*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

World Tourism Organisation (1979) *Role and Structure of National Tourism* Administrations. Madrid: WTO.

––––