Progress in tourism planning and policy

A post-structural perspective on knowledge production

Dredge, Dianne; Jamal, Tazim

Progress in Tourism Planning and Policy:
A Post-Structural Perspective on Knowledge Production

Dianne Dredge
dredge@cgs.aau.dk
Department of Culture and Global Studies
Aalborg University, Denmark

Tazim Jamal
tjamal@tamu.edu
Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences
Texas A&M University, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper examines progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge and identifies gaps and future directions for research. The study employs a post-structuralist perspective presented in two analytical movements: a bibliographic study of tourism policy and planning publications in Scopus and Science Direct and thematic analysis, plus an archaeological excavation. This combined approach pays attention to the disruptions, silences and diversity of knowledge in tourism policy and planning. It highlights the way tourism planning and policy has been problematized and reveals the social regularities shaping the production of tourism planning and policy knowledge. Multi-disciplinary, mainstream subjects related to destination development and management dominate while critical analysis of economic and political structures, interests and values is lagging. The results point to an urgent need to progress tourism planning and policy towards greater visibility, legitimacy and importance in tourism studies through more critical engagement with tourism public policy and planning practice.

Progress in Tourism Planning and Policy:
A post-structural perspective on knowledge construction

1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism planning and policy is, arguably, one of the most significant influences on how tourism develops, who wins and loses, and how benefits and impacts of tourism are distributed (Dredge & Jenkins, 2007; Hall & Jenkins, 1995). Yet what do we really know about progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge? How has it developed, and what are the influences upon the particular trajectories that have emerged? Tourism researchers frequently point to the policy implications of their research and offer normative guidance on what should be done. Few confront in a reflexive manner how they have problematized the issues and the thinking that has lead to the guidance they offer. This paper takes as its starting point that tourism planning and policy knowledge is conditioned by social factors, and that these factors influence how problems are identified, what research approaches are adopted, and, ultimately, what sort of guidance emerges. Any assessment of progress in tourism planning and policy must therefore commence with an exploration of these influences on knowledge.

This paper responds to this need for a better understanding of progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge. The paper takes an innovative policy archaeology approach (see Scheurich, 1994) for which justification is provided in the next section. We argue here that scientific, positivistic methods, such as linear historiographies, are just one approach to understanding progress in knowledge, and that alternative approaches such as we propose are generally eschewed but much needed. The paper then goes on to present a bibliographic review of literature that provides a thematic overview of contributions to the field. It also illustrates the challenges of traditional bibliographic approaches that 'measure' progress in terms of numbers of publications and linear notions of knowledge production. The subsequent section goes on to conduct an archaeological excavation of tourism planning and policy knowledge with an explicit focus on exposing the socio-political influences on our knowledge production as tourism researchers (see Foucault 1969, 1970; Scheurich, 1994). In particular, the paper takes a post-structuralist and critical policy sociology approach (Gale, 2001), differentiating itself from traditional, narrative approaches commonly used to explain the evolution of tourism planning and policy (cf. Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Dredge, Jenkins & Whitford, 2011; Hall & Zapata Campos, 2014; Jenkins, Hall & Mkono, 2014). Such

approaches often are framed within a particular cultural and institutional setting, they are often linear explanations, and therefore do not adequately take into account the influence of complex, multilayered, multi-sectoral shifts in ideas that occur in what Luhmann (1995) would call different "social interaction systems". The critical social approach we offer here is also a 'partial' view, because the complexity of different episodes of knowledge production in different interacting systems makes a comprehensive approach difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Nevertheless, such critical perspectives are especially important, as they are largely absent in tourism planning and policy, and can assist in terms of identifying broader public good implications (see also Joas and Knöbl, 2014).

The paper's objectives are therefore twofold: (1) To present an alternative, policy archaeology approach to map progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge construction since the middle of last century when tourism became part of the mainstream public policy agenda, particularly in many economically developed countries; and (2) To identify gaps and potential future directions for tourism planning and policy research. This is no easy task since tourism planning and policy is inter/multi/trans-disciplinary in character, and draws from organizational studies, political science, business management, planning, policy studies, regional development, geography, economics and sociology, resulting in a rich but highly fragmented landscape of theoretical and applied research. The complexity and fluidity of this knowledge domain and the absence of clear boundaries is a challenge that this paper confronts head on in making sense of progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge. However, given the vast span of academic fields and disciplines that contribute to this study, a comprehensive, systematic analysis of all forms and approaches to tourism planning and policy within a journal length article is clearly beyond our reach. We adopt instead a social construction of knowledge approach that focuses more on the evolution and characteristics of tourism related policy and planning in the academic domain, rather than addressing all aspects such as disaster planning and hazard mitigation policies, urban planning approaches such as comprehensive / master plans, historic preservation planning, corporate strategic planning, marketing planning, etc. A critical historiographic and archaeological methodology is employed to help identify what problems, subjects, and themes are socially legitimized in planning and policy study, i.e., what the field itself considers acceptable research and what's missing in (research) action.

Further exacerbating attempts to assess knowledge in this subfield is the shifting landscape of policy and planning related processes that result in tourism policy. Researchers have often cited Dye's (1976) position that "policy is anything governments choose to do or not to do" (e.g. see Hall 1994), an approach that has placed government at the centre of investigations. However an increasing number of scholars have sought to decentre government, raising important questions about a range of issues including the rise in the new

(collaborative) public sector and aspects such as power, influence, interests, values and agendas (c.f. Elliot 1997; Bramwell, 2006; Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Dredge, 2010; Dredge & Whitford, 2011; Mosedale, 2011; Airey & Ruhanen, 2014). In the process it is now widely held that policy cannot be understood independently from the rise of corporate influence, processes of globalization, neoliberal public management, networked governance and public-private partnerships. Not surprisingly, tourism planning and policy research has now moved beyond an analysis of what governments choose to do or not to do, to incorporate a much deeper appreciation of broader geographical, sociological, political and economic shifts. Against this background, this paper takes a critical and creative approach to assessing progress in tourism planning and policy research. It moves beyond a sequential or chronological analysis to explore the multiple knowledges and foci that have contributed to the field, and identifies the grid of constitutive forces that are at play in shaping and legitimizing what constitutes knowledge and progress in this complex, interdisciplinary, multi-scalar domain of academic research.

2. APPROACH

2.1 What is progress?

This paper acknowledges that what can pass as an informed account of 'progress' can often lack a sense of critical distance or reflexivity about its own production of truth and its claims to knowledge (Ball, 1997; Gale, 2001). 'Progress' is inherently a Modernist project, and its political, cultural and sociological dimensions have been much debated (c.f. Wagner, 2010; Woods, 1907). For example, economists have conceptualised progress in terms of an increase in economic production and consumption; political thought in Western literature has emphasised progress as achieving individual autonomy and collective self-determination; and social thought has conceptualised progress as meeting current social needs (i.e. education, health, life-expectancy, etc.) and the capacity to adapt to future needs. In another vein, critical thought has examined progress in terms of addressing those factors persisting in society that silence, marginalise or disadvantage certain groups in achieving the above political and social goals. Thus, a coherent solid notion of progress has never really existed, and discussions of post-modern pluralism and liquid modernity have weakened these discourses even further (Bauman, 2000). For some, the absence of standards or accepted wisdom with respect to how policy change might be measured and evaluated represents a slide into relativism. Multiple perspectives on progress become the norm and for some, the moral and ethical implications of not being able to assess whether progress is good or bad draws us closer to nihilism (Rule, 1997). As a result, attempts to assess progress in tourism planning and policy are caught in

the crosshairs of this debate between solid and liquid notions of progress. In this paper we acknowledge the difficulty of defining progress but argue that knowledge is cumulative and cannot be known simply through linear, scientific methods and modernist values of "progress" in terms of growth of scientific knowledge (Lyotard, 1979). Progress in tourism planning and policy research is the sum of socially constructed knowledge in the field and is not the movement from one state to a higher or better state whereby previous ideas and understandings are discarded as might occur in a Kuhn-like scientific revolution (Kuhn, 1996). The entrenched post-positivism and quantitative methodologies striving for scientific, generalized 'solutions' in tourism studies has only recently been challenged by interpretive and critical traditions that call out to stop and more carefully examine the structure and archaeology of the sub-fields that are emerging, and the legitimation of knowledge and progress within them.

Adding further to the difficulty of defining what is progress in tourism planning and policy, policy historiographies have often been presented as a sequential evolution of policy approaches, and reflexive engagement with the implicit choices, biases and blind spots in such approaches have been limited. To address these multiple challenges, we adopt a post-structuralist perspective and trace the social construction of knowledge in tourism policy and planning through two analytical movements: a small bibliographic study that illustrates thematic knowledge contribution as well as the limitation of such a linear approach, plus a tourism planning and policy archaeology (inspired by Foucault, 1969, 1970; and interpreted by Scheurich, 1994).

The thematic analysis presents an assemblage of tourism planning and policy theories, frameworks, models that have developed over time, and is principally based on an analysis of articles indexed in the Science Direct scholarly database. This database was selected simply to illustrate the range of thematic content commonly addressed in tourism policy and planning within a range of popularly cited journals in tourism studies. As noted above, critics of linear historiography argue that such sequential narratives can serve to highlight and/or obscure certain perspectives and paint a picture of planning/policy development as being homogeneous and internally consistent without regard for the different epistemological acts that interrupt and interfere with a continuous process of knowledge production (Foucault, 1969). Within the tourism literature, linear narratives of tourism policy and planning address the evolution of policy in various jurisdictions and at different scales (e.g. Kamble and Bouchon 2014; Almeida Garcia, 2014; Dieke, 1991) or can outline the progression of ideas and influences on policy development (Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Hall & Zapata-Campos 2014; Jenkins, Hall & Knono, 2014).

The remainder of the paper draws inspiration from post-structural philosophers such as Foucault (1969, 1970, 1980) and Law (2004), who argue that the world is messy and

complex, and by trying to describe and analyse phenomena in structured orderly ways is creating blind spots that obscure important ideas in the knowledge terrain. Hence, our reading of 'progress' in this latter part of the paper draws from the notion of tourism planning and policy as overlapping, intersecting discourses where there is a need to understand these various complex influences and the power relationships that shape the social construction of knowledge. It takes into account the discontinuities and unities in tourism planning and policy knowledge, the different scales at which knowledge coalesces to make sense at meta to micro levels, and legitimation of different knowledge forms such as applied and theoretical knowledge (Gale, 2001; Grimaldi, 2012). This approach to exploring progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge recognises the different ideas, frameworks, models, methodologies and processes that have circulated sometimes simultaneously and with varying degrees of acceptance and adoption (Coles, Hall & Duval, 2006; Ayikou, 2009). Knowledge accumulates directly and indirectly informing how tourism planning and policy issues are identified, problematized, researched or solved in other ways. Thus, knowledge production is unequal, and can be punctuated by gaps, silences, fads, dead-ends and opportunities. We must therefore be especially mindful of the social context and interest-laden power of ideas, theories, methods and frameworks—both past and present—that regulate knowledge production (Foucault, 1980).

The second analytical movement in this paper draws broadly from Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge*, and a method known as policy archaeology (Scheurich, 1994) to draw out the underlying group relations that lead to different formulations of tourism planning and policy knowledge. In developing this archaeological approach, Foucault wanted to move away from a linear history of ideas, and to highlight disruptions, interference and ideas that may have been overlooked. The focus of policy archaeology, explains Scheurich (1994, p.30), is to draw attention to the 'constitutive grid of conditions, forces and assumptions' that make a policy issue become a visible policy problem. This requires attention to such things as the social framing of an issue as a policy problem; the knowledge available about the issue and how this knowledge is applied to the issue so that it is perceived as a problem; and how, in this process, some interests are privileged and others silenced.

In drawing out these factors, Scheurich (1994) poses four key questions which are paraphrased for the purposes of this paper: (1) How has tourism planning and policy been framed or problematized as an issue that needs solving? (2) What are the social regularities that have shaped knowledge production in this sub-field of tourism studies? (3) How have these framings and social regularities shape planning and policy solutions in this knowledge domain? And (4) Who/what is advantaged/ disadvantaged in this knowledge production process?

2.2 The meaning and context of tourism planning and policy

Before commencing on the above questions, it is important to carefully situate what we mean by tourism planning and policy and lay out the context in we investigate these constructs. Both planning and policy are dialectical concepts: their meanings are socially constructed and depend upon the context in which they are applied; in some instances they remain "fuzzy concepts" that are loosely referred to, while other scholars attempt to nail down several different meanings for each of these terms (see Hall & Jenkins, 1995; Edgell et al., 2008, for instance). Planning and policy are also inextricably interrelated in the context of tourism governance (Dredge & Jenkins, 2007). In western liberal democracies, understandings of planning and policy have shifted significantly since the middle of the twentieth century. For most of the twentieth century, Modernist notions of the state conceived governments and their bureaucracies as powerful organs of democratic societies, and their role was to define and act for the public good. However, from the 1980s onwards, neoliberalism, globalization and new public management have prompted a downsizing and outsourcing of government functions and a move away from direct government involvement in economic and social affairs. The role of government has been recast as a facilitator and enabler of economic activity rather than an adjudicator of what might be appropriate or desirable change (Stevenson et al., 2008). This shift is described as a move from public administration to public management, and has been characterised by the increasing uptake of public-private partnerships, collaborative planning and policy development and government-business power sharing (Bramwell, 2011; Hall, 2011). It has also meant that governments' relationship with public interests has become increasingly blurred: planning and policy is no longer thought of as simply a function of government but as a process of negotiation and compromise between public and private sectors (Hall, 1994; Dredge, 2006; Hodge & Greve, 2010; Xavier & Alfred, 2008). Moreover, the notion of an overarching set of collective public interests for a broad and encompassing public good has been progressively abandoned by government policy makers in favour of a neoliberalist view that has conflated public interests with the interests of business, corporate prosperity and economic growth (e.g. Bramwell, 2011; Dredge, 2010; Mosedale, 2011). Governments are no longer viewed as independent of the private sector, nor do they have the resources or power to act unilaterally and increasingly, state resources are being channelled through the private sector profit-maximizing capital markets rather than through non-profit, civil service organizations in the 'third sector', informal economies plus local residents and community involvement in striving towards societal and environmental well-being (Beck, Giddens & Lash, 2002; Craik, 1992; Dredge & Jenkins, 2013; Harvey 2011; Swanson & Brothers, 2012).

In light of the shifting socio-political landscape above, it is argued that an account of progress in tourism planning and policy research requires critical attention to the sociology of knowledge that has shaped this sub-field of tourism studies, which we undertake using a post-structural archaeological excavation —an archaeology that acknowledges the constitutive forces that have underpinned the growth of the subfield and have produced rich and heterogeneous ecologies of tourism planning and policy knowledge.

2.3 Challenges in defining tourism planning and policy literature

2.3.1 Extent of the subfield of tourism planning and policy

Approaching progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge from this Foucauldian-inspired perspective gives rise to various methodological challenges. Bibliographic analyses are often used to evaluate research activity and structure in a particular field and may be an appropriate method if the evolution of a coherent unified body of knowledge that resides solely in the academic peer reviewed literature is the underlying assumption. These databases tend to focus on serial publications (journals, trade journals, book series and conference material) that have an ISSN (International Standard Serial Numbers). In tourism policy and planning a large body early work is contained in books (with early books not necessarily included in these databases) and there is an extensive grey literature. Focusing only on analysis of scholarly databases would therefore limit a full appreciation of the subject matter, where the warp and weft of knowledge are made up of encultured, embrained, embodied, encoded and embedded knowledges derived from theory and practice (Collins, 1993; Hall, 2010).

Despite these limitations, the databases reveal some interesting characteristics of tourism planning and policy as a subject matter, and these insights have been used to shape the envelope of literature used to create the historiography and archaeology reported here. An initial search of two prominent peer reviewed literature databases—Scopus (Elsevier) and ScienceDirect (Elsevier)—revealed 19,318 and 21,242 documents respectively with 'tourism' and 'policy' and 'planning' somewhere in the title, abstract and/or keywords published between 1980 and 2014. Google Scholar contains citation information including a wide coverage of grey literature (e.g. conference papers, theses, books, research/technical reports, and institutional repositories) and for the keyword search 'tourism planning policy' 552,000 records were returned. Google Scholar includes non-peer reviewed material such as policies, plans, consulting reports, and has no controls for the 'quality' of knowledge reported. Nevertheless these figures illustrate the breadth of sources in tourism planning and policy outside indexed scholarly work.

Closer examination of the abstracts identified in the Scopus and ScienceDirect results revealed the words 'policy' and 'planning' were used very loosely by authors who merely mention policy as an implication or outcome of their research and engage in little meaningful discussion of tourism planning and policy as defined in this paper. A search of keywords in Scopus[1] revealed only 1,616 publications over the period 1980-2014 had 'tourism policy' as a keyword, and 2000 publications had 'tourism planning' as a keyword. A review of these smaller sets of results revealed that, as would be expected, the explicit choice of these keywords meant that these papers were more focused on tourism planning and policy as conceptualised in this paper. It is this smaller set of Scopus search results that we continued to explore below in order to better understand the characteristics of the field.

A crosscheck of the publications of twenty randomly selected authors who had multiple papers spanning one or more decades of the Scopus search dates with their Internet based curriculum vitae raised questions about the reliability and coverage of the databases. Not only was the number of outputs in the Scopus search much lower than the number of outputs reported by authors in their curriculum vitae, but due to indexing limitations, the Scopus data was also less comprehensive prior to 2000. Moreover, the shifting emphasis from books to journal articles meant that key historical authors appearing from the 1970s do not appear in this list of Scopus authors and yet their on-going influence is significant (e.g. Clare Gunn's *Tourism Planning* (1988)).

Comparing the 20 authors in terms of number of outputs in 'tourism policy' and 'tourism planning' we found only four authors common to both domains. While this suggests that the two areas of literature are somewhat discrete with limited overlap, we also observed that the terms tourism, policy and planning were used loosely within the papers published by the twenty randomly selected authors. No standardized terminology existed and at times in tourism planning papers, policy was implicit and in tourism policy papers, planning was implicit to the discussion. This brief investigation corroborates earlier theoretical discussion in this paper about the socially constructed nature of these terms (i.e. planning, policy), references to which may be fuzzy or vague, other times multiply defined so as to also be confusing. The lack of clear relationships between tourism policy and the planning processes, and the interests that led to the use of these terms, also inhibits critical analysis of the complex dynamics and social-political motivations that resulted in the policy framed. The reluctance of researchers in the tourism domain to tackle this merits further investigation and may perhaps become clearer as the archaeological excavation continues below.

---

[1] Scopus indexes the following publication types: Scholarly Journals 93.12%, Trade Journal 2.62%, Report 2.44%, Book In Series 1.82%. while both Scopus and ScienceDirect overlap significantly, Scopus has a broader coverage of tourism journals and thus was used to drill down further into the tourism policy and planning literature.

2.3.2 Subject area and keyword search

An analysis of subject areas within the search results reveals the interdisciplinary nature of tourism planning and policy. Table 1 shows that social science, business, management and accounting, and environmental science contributed approximately two thirds of all tourism policy and tourism planning publications over the period 1980-2014.

Table 1 – Tourism Planning and Policy Literature by Subject Area, Scopus 1980-2014*

Subject area	Proportion of Tourism Policy Publications (%)		Proportion of Tourism Planning Publications (%)
Social Science	31.0	Social Science	27.0
Business, Management and Accounting	21.3	Business, Management and Accounting	18.2
Environmental Science	14.2	Environmental Science	15.8
Medicine	8.3	Earth and Planetary Science	10.2
Earth and Planetary Sciences	6.4	Engineering	8.9
Other	18.8	Other	19.9

Source: Data from Scopus, search period 1.1.1980 to 31.12.2014.
Note: Publications can have more than one subject area nominated

To further identify the character of this planning and policy sub-field, a keyword analysis was undertaken within the above search results. Authors sometimes do not select meaningful keywords, they use generic terms, and slight variations are used (e.g. 'humans' and 'human'). Yet despite these issues, an analysis of keywords is useful in understanding the relative focus on different themes within the tourism policy and planning literature. Table 2 shows that a significant number of keywords or phrases were common to both tourism planning and tourism policy literature. Tourism planning appeared to be primarily focused on development and management, at the strategic and destination level (40.5%), with a much smaller focus on the environment (both science and management aspects) and sustainability dimensions (14.3%), an observation that was also supported by a stronger contribution from the subject areas of environmental science and earth and planetary science (see Table 1 above). Keyword searches within tourism policy articles identified in the subject areas above (Table 1) showed a strong focus on development and management, with economic development and destination as notable foci (30.8%). 17.2% of tourism policy journals had keywords employing various

permutations of policy, as well as decision-making and government. As Table 2 shows, a very small percentage of journals addressed economics specifically in their keywords, and terms indicating the interest of a more critically oriented researcher (e.g., 'political economy', 'political ecology', 'capital accumulation' did not show up as major keywords in the tourism policy and planning journals contained in the Scopus database search but may have been present in the 'unclassified' clusters of Table 2.

Table 2 - Keywords in tourism policy and tourism planning articles

Tourism Policy Keyword Clusters	Proportion of journal articles with keyword 2000-2014 (%)	Tourism Planning Keyword Clusters	Proportion of journal articles with keyword 2000-2014 (%)
Tourism, tourism development, tourism management, sustainable development, tourist destination, economic development	30.8	Tourism, tourism development, planning, tourism management, tourism planning, strategic planning, tourist destination	40.5
Policy, policy making, tourism policy, public policy, policy implementation, decision making, government, policy approach	17.2	Decision making, planning process, local participation, planning method, stakeholder	6.5
Human, humans	8.6	Human, humans	8.6
Sustainability, environmental policy, environmental protection, environmental management	7.4	Sustainability, sustainable development, sustainable tourism, environmental protection, environmental management*	14.3
		Environmental impact, conservation, ecology**	4.9

Sectors
  Health care policy
  Ecotourism policy
  Medical tourism
	
	3.2
	2.6
	3.5
		Urban planning, regional planning, environmental planning	8.2

Tourism economics, economics	3.9	Economics, economic development, tourism economics	4.3
Other unclassified	22.8	Other unclassified	12.7

Source: Data from Scopus, search period 1.1.1980 to 31.12.2014.
Note: Publications can have more than one subject area nominated
* Articles using these keyword tended to focus more strongly on environmental management aspects
** Articles using these keywords tended to focus more strongly on environmental science aspects

2.3.3 Scholarly journals for tourism planning and tourism policy

Table 3 shows that *Tourism Management* published the most journal articles in tourism policy and planning followed by *Annals of Tourism Research*. These results suggest that scholarly

work in tourism planning and tourism policy share common outlets. However, it is important not to read too much into this analysis because there may be other keywords that imply tourism policy and planning, such as 'sustainable tourism and policy', and this search yields a different order of journals and some additional titles. Every researcher intention and action related to the construction of knowledge is imbricated in "knowledge-power" relations as Foucault's radical reconceptualization of power illustrated (1980). The very choice of key word searches, journals, databases for linear searches and even the identification of 'themes' are actions and practices in a socially constructed space of negotiated, often contested, power-knowledge relations.

Table 3 - Top 10 Journals for scholarly publishing in tourism policy and planning

(Ranked in terms of number of publications)

Tourism Planning	Tourism Policy
Tourism Management	Tourism Management
Annals of Tourism Research	Annals of Tourism Research
Advanced Materials Research	Tourism Economics
Journal of Sustainable Tourism	Current Issues in Tourism
Wit Transactions on Ecology and the Environment	Journal of Sustainable Tourism
Environmental Management	Environmental Management
Applied Mechanics and Materials	Journal of Travel Research
Tourism Geographies	International Journal of Tourism Policy
Current Issues in Tourism	Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research
Journal of Travel Research	Wit Transactions on Ecology and the Environment

Source: Scopus search, tourism planning and policy publications, 1980-2014.

While this above analysis of the database provides some useful insights into the body of literature contained within the Scopus database, this paper also sought to present a longitudinal analysis which requires a sensitivity to disruptions and epistemological breaks. Not only are the databases less reliable prior to 2000 when very few tourism planning and policy articles were recorded each year, but the references contained in the databases are not useful in understanding the shifting social contexts, values and research trends that have occurred over time since only recently have researchers started to engage more reflexively with the influence of values, experiences and context on their research. As mentioned earlier, we also know that there are a number of books prior to this time that chart the early development of the field as well as a corpus of 'grey literature' that blurs the relations between tourism planning and policy research and practice. These factors mean that relying on a bibliographic analysis would at best only reveal partial insights into progress in tourism planning and policy.

The above analysis was used to scope the field, to better understand the landscape in terms of subject areas, keywords, authors and key journals, but the challenges noted above reveal that there are limitations in using scholarly databases to characterise progress in tourism planning and policy, and areas such as 'economics' as well as critical analysis appears to be relatively small compared to more dominant research interests in development and management. As is evident above, we have refrained from using citation counts and other such tools as a metric that identifies the 'top' authors in tourism policy and planning, for neither the number of refereed publications nor the type of publication (book, refereed article appear to lend themselves to straightforward assessment of the interests and politics that shape their contributions to the socially construction of knowledge. Deeper readings of the literature are needed to understand the particular contextual factors, values, ontologies and epistemologies that shape the field over time. Hence, rather than focus on 'seminal' figures and the most cited authors, we have chose to provide a bibliometric study above that leads to further exposition of some key themes or "currents" below.

The thematic analysis presented below is, of course, partial and situated. Spurgin (2006) observes that sense-making processes involve researchers making sense of problems in space and time; they are experts and come with their own theories, biases, experiences and understandings influenced by their own time-space connections. Thus, we cannot remove our own subjectivities from this analysis of 'progress' in tourism planning and policy, but we can take steps to ensure that we have indeed holistically and responsibly addressed the collective body of literature by, firstly, taking into account the above bibliographic analysis and the deeper account below of some major "currents" or themes, secondly, by receiving collegial review from several tourism planning and policy researchers prior to submission, and thirdly, through the peer review process to which this paper is subject. Each adds an additional layer of verification to our account.

3. THEMES IN TOURISM PLANNING AND POLICY

The comprehensive literature on the planning and policy knowledge domain noted above presented a daunting task to 'excavate' and it became quickly apparent that there was little evidence of a clear 'progression' in the field. As demonstrated below, what we have identified are major 'currents' or themes that cross-cut various decades over the span of tourism studies, specifically the sub-field of policy and planning that is of interest to us here. We argue that there is no clean, neat chronological or sequential emergence of different planning approaches and policy models that can be traced in this highly complex knowledge domain. While rational scientific planning may have been operating in western liberal societies in the 1970s, 'community-based' decision-making was a political-cultural given in other societal contexts,

and these continue to be present simultaneously in different spatiotemporal contexts through to the present. Some key thematic moments or 'currents' can be identified within this knowledge domain as presented below which, again, we do not claim to be complete—the researcher's view is always partial and situated, inherently a social construction, as discussed earlier. Our focus below is to deconstruct the "social space" of knowledge production from a critical social perspective.

3.1 Rational scientific planning and policy process models

Drawing from parent disciplines and fields of study including policy studies, public administration, political science, regional development and planning, and influenced by the dominance of positivism and scientific method over much of the twentieth century, there was a strong focus on prescribing the ideal planning process (e.g. Getz, 1986, 1987; Gunn, 1988; Inskeep, 1988, 1991; Jafari, 1987). The dominant epistemological perspective underpinning tourism planning and policy at the time was influenced by the ideas of Weber and Taylor, a belief in systems thinking, rational scientific methods and the hegemony of government (c.f. Leiper, 1990a, 1990b; Mill & Morrison, 1985; McIntosh & Goeldner, 1986; Inskeep, 1991). Notions of public interest were simple and uncomplicated, dominated by the views of predominantly middle class, ethnically homogenous public officials (Dobuzinskis, 1997; Jones, 1984). Participation was relegated to a single step in planning and policy processes that would be conducted with key interest groups and individuals identified by public officials as being relevant to the process. As a result, only certain voices were given the opportunity to be heard, and public bureaucrats were the experts and gatekeepers of authoritative knowledge.

Even these process-driven scientific models of tourism planning and policy did not form a unified body of knowledge. There were different views about what constituted tourism planning and policy processes, often influenced by local institutional contexts or inspired by particular parent disciplines. For example, tourism planning models were inspired by developments in allied fields such as forestry, recreation and park planning (cf McCool & Moisey, 2009; Eagles and McCool, 2002), while the strategic management literature appears inspirational for some researchers proposing sustainable tourism planning and policy frameworks (e.g. Jamal and Getz, 1996; Wahab & Pigram, 1997), or disaster preparedness and crisis management (Bierman, 2010; Hystad & Keller 2008; Ritchie, 2004).

3.2 Spatial planning and destination development models

Spatial models for tourism planning and policy emerged in the 1960s and strengthened in the 1970s influenced by landscape architecture, urban and regional planning. For example, Gunn

(1972, 1988, 1993) prescribes the desired spatial organization of land uses within destinations to maximise the functioning of the tourism system. Descriptive/explanatory models of the evolution of resort destinations were also offered with a view to making predictive claims or providing normative guidance on destination planning (Getz, 1983; Gunn, 1972, 1988, 1993; Smith, 1992). While not explicitly directed at solving policy questions, the destination lifecycle model (Butler, 1980) and the recreational business district model (Getz, 1993) influenced policymakers' interpretation of policy issues and this inevitably shaped the way destination planning and policy problems were identified and addressed.

The blurring of practice and research is also evident in this spatial planning tradition. International development consultants working with the UNWTO and the World Bank adopted rational scientific processes and spatial models in their policy work in developing countries offering refinements that were published in academic journals and textbooks (e.g. Kaiser & Helber, 1978; Jenkins, 1980; Lawson, 1983 Lickorish, 1991; Inskeep, 1991). Moreover, developing countries eager to attract foreign investment and access incentives through the International Monetary Fund's Structural Adjustment Facility were also heavily influenced by or even required to adopt such spatial models illustrating the social regularities—or the forces that constitute what is viable and credible—that were in place at the time. The planning of Mexican mega-resorts (e.g., Cancun, Ixtapa, Bahias de Huátulco, etc.) by FONATUR in cooperation with international agencies in the 1970s and 1980s are evidence of these spatial policy approaches (Bosselman, Peterson & McCarthy, 1999; Clancy, 1999) and UNWTO plans for Malta, Oman, Goa and Zanzibar all adopted similar spatial policy prescriptions for tourism development (see Inskeep, 1991).

Over time, as the Modernist project strengthened, these spatial and procedural models underwent refinement. Generic models and frameworks splintered to address particular tourism planning and policy questions or challenges e.g. environmentally-based procedural models (Dowling, 1993), community models of tourism development (Murphy, 1988a, 1988b; Simmons, 1994), models for cultural heritage (du Cross, 2001) and site planning and impact management in heritage tourism (Orbasli & Woodward, 2009). Models for balancing tourist supply and demand (Arbel & Bargur, 1976) and models to assess the economic impacts of tourism policies (Lungren, 1973; Archer, 1985) also emerged, and the consolidation of these scientific tools led Inskeep (1988) to claim that tourism planning was emerging specialization.

3.3 Economic tools for tourism planning and policy

The value of tourism as a tool for economic development has been an important factor in the way tourism planning and policy issues have been framed and knowledge produced. A small

but consistent theme in both research and practice literature focuses on policies that can best maximise the economic benefits of tourism to local, regional and national economies. Tools and frameworks to assess the impact and effectiveness of tourism policies, plans and development projects also emerged, including techniques such as cost-benefit analysis, multiplier analysis, input-output analysis, general equilibrium modelling and, later, tourism satellite accounting (Dwyer & Forsyth, 1993; Dwyer, Forsyth & Spurr, 2004). These developments provide knowledge inputs into government and business planning and decision-making (e.g. impacts on foreign investment, employment, regional development, airline deregulation, etc.), shaping how issues were problematized and the canvas of policy solutions available (e.g. Dwyer & Forsyth, 1992).

3.4 Institutional theories, roles and responsibilities

Limited attention had been placed on understanding interests, roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders in tourism policy prior to the increasing uptake of postmodern epistemologies. However, from the 1990s questions about the existing and desired future role of governments, business and communities in tourism planning and policy and what their interests and responsibilities were raised more frequently (cf. Bramwell & Lane 2000, 2011; Jamal and McDonald, 2011; Michael, 2001). Attention turned to understanding institutional arrangements (cf. Airey & Chong, 2011; Deike, 1991; Dredge, 2001; Hall, 2003; Jenkins, 1995; Pearce, 1996; Zhang & Ap, 1999), the roles, responsibilities, power and interests of industry (cf. Craik, 1991; Lickorish, 1991), the nature of intergovernmental relations (cf. Dredge & Jenkins, 2003; Jenkins & Sorensen, 1996; Pforr, 2006) and business-government relationships (cf. Carroll, 1991; Lickorish, 1991; Jenkins, 2000). Such research gave rise to a small number of critically oriented analyses of power structures (Bramwell & Lane, 2000; Church, 2007; Hall, 1993; Kerr, Barron, & Wood, 2001; Milne & Ateljevic, 2001; Everett and Jamal, 2004; Saarinen, 2004).

3.5 The relational turn in planning and policy

Emerging from the recasting of roles and responsibilities in tourism policy, questions started to focus on the effectiveness and inclusiveness of engagement processes (e.g. Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Bramwell & Lane, 2000; Hall, 1994; Stevenson, Airey & Miller, 2009). This focus was inspired by broader developments in planning (e.g. Healey, 2006) known as the relational turn, which focused on managing collaborative relationships and relational politics. In a managerialist discourse, relationships were increasingly seen as key for effective planning and policy, and questions started to emerge about how best to manage complex

relationships and develop effective collaboration (e.g. Beaumont & Dredge, 2010; Bramwell & Lane, 2000; Jamal & Getz, 1996). Critical scholars argued that governments were increasingly making policy in partnership with business, public interests were reinterpreted from the prism of business values, and community, indigenous and other marginalised interests were often not receiving sufficient attention (Dredge 2010; Higgins-Desbiolles 2008, 2009, 2011; Sharpley & Telfer, 2008; Tosun, 2000). Using different theoretical lenses, researchers began to explore the social forces or regularities that shape how tourism policy is framed and what solutions are viewed as credible (cf. Dredge & Jenkins, 2013; Mosedale, 2014; Michael, 2001) while case studies explored the social regulation of tourism policy (cf. Anastasiadou, 2008; Dinica, 2009; Wang & Ap, 2013). Critical planners and community-oriented academics to draw upon the non-profit and other 'third space' organizations well as local residents to engage in community-based tourism, local control and direct participation in policy and planning decision making (Arnstein, 1968; Forester, 2000). This relational turn and the changing institutional environment also prompted interest in both network relations (cf. Baggio, Scott & Cooper, 2007, 2010; Beaumont & Dredge, 2010; Tyler & Dinan, 2001) and governance (cf. Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Pastras & Bramwell, 2013).

3.6 The critical turn: Who wins and loses

The broader field of policy studies has always been concerned with power relations and who wins and who loses as a result of policy (Hall & Jenkins, 1995; Reed, 1997). The critical postmodern turn re-engaged with power, and in tourism policy, the focus was directed towards critiquing who wins and loses in tourism policy. Much research has been focused on exploring government-business-community power relations but there is also a small and growing body of investigations that explore the impacts of tourism on marginalised interests and implications for sustainability oriented planning and policy (Jamal and Stronza, 2009; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008, 2011; Outterson, Selinger & Wyte, 2012; Jamal & Camargo, 2014). This theme is characterised by a sharpened sense of reflexivity, with researchers engaging in such issues as identity politics, justice and ethics in tourism planning and policy-making. Similar movements can be observed in related knowledge domains such as from critically oriented planning theorists in urban planning like Forester (2000) and Sandercock (1998) who influenced greater awareness of power, negotiation and conflict tourism planning and policy researchers.

3.7 Community engagement and participation

Researchers influenced by scientific rationality tended to present normative models of how public participation or community engagement processes ought to be (e.g. Murphy, 1985; Inskeep, 1991); they evaluated public participation exercises (e.g. Keogh, 1990; Simmons, 1994); developed frameworks, tools and assessment techniques to assess community participation (e.g. Reid, Mair & George, 2004; Tosun, 2005); or provided generic advice on how to manage engagement (e.g. Truly Sautter & Leisen, 1999). The postmodern turn prompted critical researchers in a variety of fields, but notably urban and regional planning, to investigate participation which in turn highlighted institutional and social processes that shape and (dis)empower participation (Healey, 1997). The level of access that different actors have in planning and policy processes can be uneven, which affects the knowledge inputs into the process, and the way that information is shared, reproduced and given meaning by stakeholders (Hall, 1994; Getz & Jamal, 1994; Higgins Desbiolles, 2009; Jamal & Getz, 1999). These insights have in turn driven the development of recent case specific models of community engagement (Okazaki, 2008; Marzuki & Hay, 2013), and research in aspects such as trust in institutions (Nunkoo, 2012) and public interest (Dredge, 2010).

3.8 Values and priorities

A theme of increasing importance concerns the issue of values in tourism planning and policy. Since 2000 in particular, attention has shifted from framing tourism solely as an instrument of economic or social development, to position it as an environmental and a socio-political phenomenon, and to question the role it could play in addressing other pressing societal issues (cf. Chheang, 2008; Dredge, Jenkins, & Whitford, 2011; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006, 2008, 2009; Honey & Gilpin, 2009). Researchers have noted that some actors and interests are being marginalised in prevailing discourses about tourism planning and policy that focus almost exclusively on economic values, an argument that is particularly prominent in international development, local tourism politics, environmental and social justice research (c.f. Hall, 1994; Hales and Jamal, 2015; Richins & Pearce, 2000; Burns & Novelli, 2007; Sharpley & Telfer, 2008; Sharpley, 2009; United Nations, 1992; UNEP, 2003).

3.9 Evaluation and monitoring

As previously discussed, a range of tools, frameworks and methodologies inspired by scientific rationalism were developed in attempts to measure, monitor and evaluate tourism and the effects of tourism policy. This line of knowledge building activity has continued under the post-modern turn, albeit splintering in a variety of directions. These new developments have responded to challenges associated with the benchmarking and assessing

performance in, for example, sustainable tourism (see Buckley, 2012; Tanguary, Rajaonson & Therrien, 2012), destination competitiveness (e.g. Kozak, 2002; Kozak & Rimmington, 1999) and social-ecological resilience (e.g. Ruiz-Balasteros, 2013) using a variety of post-positivist, social constructionist and ethnographic approaches.

3.10 Planning and policy dynamics

A nascent line of tourism planning and policy research engages with the ideas associated with post-structuralism, including mobilities, liquid modernity and policy complexity. This research examines how a range of mobile interests over time and space impact upon tourism policy; and how tourism policy is also complicit in and impacted by these flows (Saarinen, 2004; Sheller & Urry, 2004; Farsari, Butler & Szivas, 2011; Hultman & Hall, 2012; Dredge & Jamal, 2013). This line of investigation has coalesced with ideas about the mobility of tourism planning and policy spaces, with research examining the expanding and overlapping intersectoral nature of tourism policy (e.g. Haughland, Ness, Grønseth & Aarstad, 2010). Policy complementaries, trade-offs, path dependency and opportunities for path creation policies fall within this type of tourism planning and policy knowledge (Henriksen & Halkier 2009).

3.11 Reflexive Practice

There is a small theme about reflexive practice that appears to be gaining momentum within the last decade influenced by the earlier works of planning researchers Schon (1980) and Flyvbjerg (2004). Influenced by wider developments in the fields of regional development and planning (e.g. Amin and Roberts, 2008), this theme focuses on the importance of learning from each other, learning from the communities they work with, and the importance of knowledge co-production. Within this theme, there is also an important thread of discussion about ethics and positionality (e.g. Feighery, 2010) and the co-production of planning and policy knowledge (Dredge and Jenkins, 2011). A small but growing awareness of diverse populations and gender roles in tourism research and practice will hopefully bring greater attention to the role of women and the legitimation of traditional and ethnic perspectives in the knowledge domain of tourism planning and policy (Jamal & Camargo, 2014).

4.0 AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF TOURISM PLANNING AND POLICY KNOWLEDGE

The above thematic analysis presents an overview of key themes in the tourism planning and policy literature. As mentioned earlier, these themes have not emerged sequentially. Attention

to the various themes has been uneven, reflecting variations in the ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions that have driven social science research. In this section, we return to Scherich's first three questions above, presenting an archaeology of tourism planning and policy knowledge that excavates the 'constitutive grid' of forces shaping knowledge production in the field. The fourth question: *Who/what is advantaged/disadvantaged in this knowledge production process?* we return to in the conclusions.

4.1 How has tourism planning and policy been framed/problematized?

Policy archaeology questions how a policy problem has come to be, positing that policy problems are social constructions and that there are complex groups of relations that lead to social issues becoming policy problems. Drawing from Foucault's (1970) desire to disturb taken-for-granted construction of policy problems, and to better understand the factors that contribute to social issues becoming problems that attract the gaze of the state, it is important to understand how issues are framed, become 'manifested, nameable and describable' (Scheurich, 1994, p.98). Based on the previously identified themes, Table 4 illustrates how these themes link to various framings of tourism policy problems.

Table 4 – Problematisation of tourism planning and policy issues

Themes in tourism planning and policy	Focus of problematisation
Rational scientific planning and policy processes	Tourism planning and policy as a **process**
Spatial planning and development models	Tourism planning and policy as a means to shape **physical (destination) development**
Economic tools	Planning and policy as a tool to facilitate **economic growth and development**
Institutional theories, roles and responsibilities	**Roles and responsibilities** of government, business and community
The relational turn in planning and policy	Planning and policy as **relationship management**
Critical turn	**Power** in tourism planning and policy
Community engagement	**Public interest**, access to tourism planning and policy processes
Values and priorities	**Ends/purpose** of tourism planning and policy
Evaluation and monitoring	**Evaluating outcomes**, impacts
Dynamics and knowledge flows	**Managing change**, mobilities, interrelations between policy sectors
Reflexive practice	**Researcher involvement** and action

This table draws attention to the way in which various themes identified earlier in the literature are manifestations of, or responses to, the way policy problems have been framed. For example, if we seek to identify the best process to develop a tourism policy, we have already framed the task in terms of a process, made up of tasks that (more or less) run sequentially. The boundedness of this framing makes it difficult to think of a way to develop policy that is not a linear process. In other words, the identification of the issue itself, and the language used to denote it, constrains possible understandings of the problem and places limitations on the way a policy problem can be researched and understood. Therefore, problematization, itself a social construction, has a powerful role in limiting or creating thresholds to our understanding of tourism planning and policy (Dredge, Jenkins & Whitford, 2011).

4.2 What are the social regularities that shape knowledge production?

Social regularities are 'categories of thought and ways of thinking' that are encoded and regulate the production of problems and solution building, often without the policymaker being explicitly aware of such influences (Scheurich, 1994, p.100). Over the course of the twentieth century there have been seismic developments in the social sciences that have impacted upon progress in tourism planning and policy knowledge production. While the above thematic analysis of tourism planning and policy commences from the mid-twentieth century, it is important to draw attention to the influence of powerful historical ideas and the processes of social regulation that have revolutionised how we generate and value knowledge (Outhwaite, 2007). In particular, the Enlightenment gave rise to rationality and scientific method that was to have a profound effect on approaches to understanding in the social sciences. The rational scientific method upheld the idea that social relations—including those central to policy studies such as relationships between the public sphere, institutions of the state and commercial interests—could be understood through structured and systematic data collection and analysis. Bias could be removed and facts and figures could describe a universal reality.

Weber's mechanistic ideas about the centrality of government and public administration contributed to the dominance of rational scientific approaches to policymaking from the mid-twentieth century (Weber, 2009). In Weber's view, facts about a policy issue such as tourism could be removed and assessed independently of socio-political and administrative contexts, scenarios could be developed and hypothetically tested, and objective decisions could be made to advance some greater public good defined by bureaucrats who knew best. Policy-making was also conceptualised as a linear process that commenced with

the setting of goals, information was then collected, different scenarios were evaluated, and one was selected for implementation that would achieve predetermined goals.

Frederick Taylor's rational scientific principles for public administration (also known as Taylorism) developed in the early part of the century provided the basis for the expansion and specialization of the public service (see Dredge & Jenkins, 2007). The authority of knowing rested with government and its bureaucrats, and universal truths and explanations of cause and consequence could be constructed making them the experts in decision-making.

While these ideas provided a powerful backdrop to the way the role of bureaucracy and the policymaking process were understood, the values and approaches to tourism policy in the post-World War II period were also significantly influenced by the economic, social and political optimism that accompanied Modernity. Modernist notions of progress prioritised economic development and technology, so the growth of mass tourism through technological innovation was hardly surprising. Governments entered the tourism planning and policy arena with their focus firmly on responding to how governments could best encourage tourism. Boosterism and supply-led policies were widely adopted based on the idea that direct government investment in attractions and infrastructure would increase tourist visitation and lead to economic growth and social progress (e.g. Inskeep, 1991).

However, growing criticisms of the scientific method were captured in Lyotard's *Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (1979). This report and the writings of postmodern philosophers was to provide a pivotal moment of reflection, and an epistemological disruption to the hegemony of rational scientific policymaking. Lyotard's (1979) disrupted taken-for-granted understandings about knowledge, public interest and authority, and held a magnifying glass to the way policy-making had traditionally been positioned as value-neutral. According to Lyotard, all science was a type of narrative, a form of storytelling that employs language, terminology, rules, protocols and procedures. Lyotard questioned the grand narratives and universal truths of the scientific method highlighting the importance of micro-narratives and alternative forms of knowledge production from a broader spectrum of knowledge holders. The impact of this critical postmodern turn on tourism planning and policy processes had profound long-term consequences. The displacement of scientific rationality as the only legitimate form of tourism planning and policy knowledge opened up alternative methods of research and practice. Knowledge and expertise could exist outside government in a range of communities and actors. Inspired by post-structural and critical scholars like Foucault (1970, 1980, 1991) with respect to power and knowledge, Habermas (1973; 1984) with respect to subjective rationality and communicative action, and Giddens (1984) with respect to structure- agency relationships, planning and policy researchers began to disassemble the structures and frameworks that had shaped thinking up to that point.

In tourism planning and policy, Richter (1983, 1987) and Matthews (1975, 1978) argued that the politics of tourism could not be separated from policy, arguments later reinforced and built upon by other researchers (e.g. Bramwell, 2006; Burns, 2004; Hall, 1994; Hall & Jenkins 1995; Dredge & Jenkins 2007). This attention to the influence of power and politics in tourism policy-making, and an unravelling of the Modernist idea of a hegemonic state power contributed to growing criticisms of scientific methods in tourism policy. Moreover, useful knowledge resided in a range of places inside and outside governments and it became important to engage with a variety of actors and ways of knowledge production in tourism planning and policy making.

The influence of neoliberal economic management on tourism planning and policy has been discussed at length elsewhere (e.g. Bramwell 2006; Dredge & Jenkins 2013), and these ideas have had an important impact on what type of knowledge generated. Neoliberalism has brought with it a distancing of government from direct policy interventions, the rise of public-private partnerships and networked governance and a shifting of responsibilities to the private and non-government sectors. Not surprisingly, this shifting landscape of ideas and values has significantly influenced ontological, epistemological and methodological framings of tourism planning and policy, and the social regularities that circulate among practitioner planners and policy makers.

4.3 How has knowledge production been influenced by problematization and social regularities?

Scheurich's (1994) third question concerns how the above discussed framings of tourism issues and the social regularities at play shape knowledge production in tourism planning and policy. For example, the social regularities associated with rational scientific approaches to planning and policy placed government at the centre of power and tended to privilege normative and procedural knowledge production. However, under neoliberal public management, social regularities suggest that power is distributed across government and nongovernment stakeholders, and consequently knowledge production has tended to privilege explorations of stakeholder relations, networks and collaborative planning. The role of power and the question of whose interests were being met or marginalized were subsumed to a managerialist discourse about how to manage networks and multiple interests, and has done little to show how neoliberal policies have empowered dominant groups and corporate interests. What values and perspectives are advantaged and disadvantaged in the knowledge production process is the focus of Scherich's fourth question. Scheurich (1994) argued that certain values and dominant worldviews are reinforced in both research and practice, and alternative framings and knowledge can be silenced as a result of the way in which issues are

framed as problems, and as social regularities play out to influence the production of knowledge. To better understand what areas of tourism planning and policy knowledge has received greater attention, we return to the bibliographic analysis undertaken previously. Table 2 suggests that social science approaches to tourism planning and policy dominate, this tells us little of the way in which certain interests are marginalised or empowered within this broad disciplinary focus. Keywords (Table 3) suggest that tourism planning and policy as an areas of research has tended to focus significantly on developing and managing tourism, a finding that is supported by the thematic analysis and archaeological excavation that illustrate how various factors contribute to privileging certain problem formulations and methodological approaches, while eschewing the study of the diminishing role of government in protecting the 'public good' and the interests of disadvantaged groups.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

Ren, Pritchard and Morgan (2010) argue that there are a range of socio-material, discursive, technological and institutional practices that permeate theory and practice making it impossible to divide knowledge into neat categories. We argue that it is nevertheless important to be able to assess literature, to highlight the influences on and direction of knowledge production, to be sensitive to the implicit and explicit factors that push issues to become problems, and subsequently, to acknowledge how research becomes complicit in framing and consolidating certain policy problems. The contributions of this paper are therefore twofold. First, we have offered a different methodology based on a critical social perspective to excavate the underlying archaeology of tourism planning and policy knowledge, and in the process sensitise researchers to issues of problematization, social regularities and knowledge production. Second, we have drawn attention to what might be considered a paradox of policy problematization, that is, what and how we know shapes the identification of tourism planning and policy problems, but the very act of identifying and codifying the issue as a research problem constrains what can be known and constitutes "power-knowledge" (Foucault, 1980), not simply what appears to be a 'neutral' scientific analysis of progression of tourism planning and policy knowledge.

A major aim of this paper was to explore "progress" in tourism planning and policy. In addressing this aim, this paper confronted philosophical questions about the production of tourism planning and policy knowledge and it challenged the meaning of 'progress', distancing itself from an authoritative sequential narrative to acknowledging the diverse epistemological movements, the splintering, disruptions and the coalescence of themes in this dynamic terrain. This paved the way to examine the social construction of knowledge in this area with the help of two analytical movements: a bibliographic, thematic analysis plus a

post-structuralist archaeology (excavation) of tourism policy and planning inspired by the work of Michel Foucault. The first occurs by identifying shifts in the problematization of tourism as a policy issue, the social regularities that shape how the problem is addressed, the planning and policy moves that are available as a result of this framing, and a range of tourism planning themes that have emerged. The latter critically excavates the information further into a constitutive grid of conditions, assumptions forces and ideas that have shaped tourism planning and policy knowledge. The contributions of this paper are, therefore, an innovative mapping of the social-political space of knowledge formation, and the development of a more robust methodology that sensitises us to the way tourism planning and policy knowledge has been generated, and liberates us from the socio-cultural conditionings that implicitly shape our capacity as researchers to freely choose our methods and approaches.

However, there are limitations to this critical approach. First, for some it may be ironic that in arguing for a liberation from the sequential narrative of 'progress' in tourism planning and policy, we have imposed a different set of structures represented in the tourism policy archaeology. We accept this criticism, but argue that the paper offers a much-needed understanding of tourism planning and policy where there has been limited methodological development on how to undertake such a complex endeavor. The second limitation is that the paper is predominantly an examination of progress in tourism policy in the context of western (English speaking) liberal democracies. In other social, political and economic contexts, the framing of tourism policy problems, the social regularities shaping policy solutions and knowledge production may be quite different. Accordingly, understandings of progress in tourism policy offered in this paper are partial and not generalisable, but the methodology proposed may be a starting point for further investigation.

The second aim of this paper was to identify gaps and potential future directions for tourism planning and policy research. In particular, emerging discourses around re-valuing tourism as a means of achieving a range of social, political, environmental objectives (and not simply as a tool for economic development), and captured in the notion of tourism policy for world-making, has not permeated the tourism policy research. Even less evident are critical deconstructions of the material processes and capital structures that shape increasingly neoliberal landscapes of tourism planning and policy. This is a gap or silence that is yet to consolidate and represents a potentially important area of future research. A number of researchers have identified future research opportunities, offering an array of ideas that align with their own interests and particular lenses (e.g. Jenkins et al. (2014) identify e-government, digital citizenship, metagovernance; Dodds & Butler (2009) cite sustainability; Farasi et al. (2010), mental modelling, sustainability and so on). Most of these suggestions have failed to appreciate the constitutive grid of forces that shape tourism planning and policy. What is needed is greater engagement with what we term "conscious tourism planning and policy

research"—a landscape of knowledge-making by tourism researchers that is conscious to the social regularities and values that underpin it, mindful of the constitutive forces identified in this tourism policy archaeology, and that embraces different forms of knowledge production. Conscious tourism planning and policy research differentiates itself from the simple conclusions and normative suggestions about policy that are often found at the end of tourism research. Morally conscious research helps bridges the theory-practice dichotomy through reflexivity, critical engagement and *praxis*—research activism, such as via embedded community research (Dredge, Hales & Jamal, 2013). It strives towards a critical social research and knowledge production that challenges the erosion of public goods and the local-global commons due to neoliberal policy and planning.

Finally, over the last 10 years there has been marked growth in the reflexivity of researchers, with the values that underpin research, and the factors that shape problem identification. However, what is really needed is a deeper appreciation of researcher agency and engagement in planning and policy related dialogues inside and outside the academy. There is an urgent need to progress not just towards greater visibility, legitimacy and importance within tourism studies, but also to meaningfully engage in the character, role and impact of governmental and other political interests in the local-global governance of tourism. The constitutive grid of forces depicted in this archaeology of tourism policy knowledge illustrates that the relationship is iterative and interdependent, and research activism and praxis is urgent to ensure that the knowledge domain within tourism studies is fair and just, and that it correlates with the realities of tourism policy making and planning practice outside the (still) ivory towers of academic research.

REFERENCES

Airey, D. & Chong, K. (2011). *Tourism in China: Policy and development since 1949*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Airey, D. & Ruhanen, L. (2014). Tourism policy-making in Australia: A national and state perspective. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 11(2), 149-162.

Almeida Garcia, F. (2014). A comparative study of the evolution of tourism policy in Spain and Portugal, Tourism Management Perspectives, 11(1), 34-50.

Amin, A., and Roberts, J. (2008). Knowing in action: Beyond communities of practice, *Research Policy*, 37(2), 353-369

Anastasiadou, C. (2008). Tourism interest groups in the EU policy arena: Characteristics, relationships and challenges, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 11(1), 24-62.

Arbel, A. and Bargur, J. (1976). An empirical application of a comprehensive planning model of the tourism industry. *Journal of Travel Research,* 15(2), 19-23.

Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4), 216-224.

Ayikou, M. (2009). Epistemology, ontology and tourism. In Tribe, J. *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications. pp.62-79.

Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2007). *Network Analysis and Tourism*. Clevedon: ChannelView.

Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010). Improving tourism destination governance: A complexity science approach. *Tourism Review*, *65*(4), 51–60.

Ball, S. (1997). Policy sociology and critical social research: a personal review of recent education policy and policy research, *British Educational Research Journal*, 23 (3), 257-274.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge & Malden: Policy.

Beaumont, N. & Dredge, D. (2010). Local tourism governance: A comparison of three network approaches. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 18(1), 7-28.

Beck, U., Giddens, A. and Lash, S. (2002). *Reflexive modernization : Politics, tradition and aesthetics in modern social order*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Beirman, D. (2011) The integration of emergency management and tourism, *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 26(3), 30-34.

Bosselman, F., Peterson, C., & McCarthy, C. (1999). *Managing Tourism Growth*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Bramwell, B. (2006). Actors, power and discourses of growth. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 33(4), 957-978.

Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 19(4/5), 459-477.

Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2000). *Tourism Collaboration and Partnerships: Politics, practice and sustainability*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). *Critical Perspectives on Governance and Sustainability*. London: Routledge.

Bramwell, B. & Sharman, A. (1999). Collaboration in local tourism policymaking, *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(2), 392-415.

Bramwell, B. & Meyer, D. (2007). Power and tourism policy relations in transition, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(3), 766-788.

Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 528-546.

Burns, P. (2004). Tourism planning: A third way? *Annals of Tourism Research,* 31(1), 24-43.

Burns, P., & Novelli, M. (2007). *Tourism and Politics: Global frameworks and local realities*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Butler, R. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources, *Canadian Geographer,* 24(1), 5-12.

Carroll, P. (1991). Policy issues and tourism. In P. Carroll, K. Donahue, M. McGovern and J. McMillan (Eds.), *Tourism in Australia* (pp. 20-43). Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Chheang, V. (2008). The political economy of tourism in Cambodia, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *13*(3), 281–297.

Church, A. (2007). Local and regional tourism policy and power. In A. Lew, C. M. Hall and A. M. Williams (Eds.), *A Companion to Tourism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing (pp. 555-568).

Clancy, M. (1999). Tourism development: Evidence from Mexico, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(1), 1-26.

Coles, T., Hall, C.M. & Duval, D. (2006). Tourism and post-displinary inquiry, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(4/5), 293-319.

Collins, H. (1993). The structure of knowledge. *Social Research*, 60, 95-116.

Craik, J. (1991). *Resorting to tourism: Cultural policies for tourism development in Australia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Craik, J. (1992). Australian tourism: The emergence of a state coordinated consultative framework. In S. Bell & J. Wanna (Eds.), *Business - Government Relations in Australia* (pp. 231-242). Sydney: Harcourt Jonanovich Publishers.

Deike, P.U.C. (1991). Policies for tourism development in Kenya, *Annals of Tourism research*, 18, 269-294.

Dinica, V. (2009). Governance for sustainable tourism: A comparison of international and Dutch visions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *17*(5), 583–603.

Dobuzinskis, L. (1997). Historical and epistimological trends in public administration, *Journal of Management History, 3*(4), 298-316.

Dodds, R., & Butler, R.W. (2009). Inaction more than action: Barriers to the implementation of sustainable tourism policies in Gossling, S., Hall, C.M. & Weaver, D. (Eds.). *Sustainable Tourism Futures Perspectives on Systems, Restructuring and Innovations*. (pp. 43‑57). Routledge: London

Dowling, R. (1993). An environmentally-based planning model for regional tourism development, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 1(1), 17-37.

Dredge, D. (2001). Local government tourism planning and policy-making in New South Wales, Australia: Institutional development and historical legacies, *Current Issues in Tourism*.

Dredge, D. (2006). Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism, *Tourism Management*, 27(2), 269-280.

Dredge, D. (2010). Place change and tourism development conflict: Evaluating public interest, *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 104-112.

Dredge, D., Hales, R. and Jamal, T. (2013) Community Case Studies in Tourism: Researcher Operacy, reflexivity and making research matter. *Tourism Analysis*, 18(1), 29-43.

Dredge, D. & Jenkins, J. (2011). *Stories of Practice: Tourism planning and policy*. Surrey: Ashgate.

Dredge, D. & Jenkins, J. (2013). Australian national tourism policy: Influences of reflexive and political modernisation, *Tourism Planning and Development*, 9 (3), 231-251.

Dredge, D., & Jamal, T. (2013). Mobilities on the Gold Coast, Australia: Implications for destination governance and sustainable tourism, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *21*(4), 557–579.

Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2003). Federal-state relations and tourism public policy. *Current Issues in Tourism,* 6(5), 415-443.

Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2007). *Tourism Policy and Planning*. Brisbane: John Wiley & Sons.

Dredge, D., Jenkins, J., & Whitford, M. (2011). Stories of practice. In D. Dredge, J. Jenkins, & M. Whitford (Eds.), *Stories of Practice: Tourism planning and policy*. Surrey & Burlington: Ashgate.

Dredge, D., & Whitford, M. (2011). Event tourism governance and the public sphere, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 19(4/5), 479-499.

du Cross, H. (2001). A new model to assist in planning for sustainable cultural heritage tourism, *The International Journal of Tourism Research,* 3(2), 165-165.

Dye, T. (1976). *Understanding Public Policy* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Dwyer, L. & Forsyth, P. (1992). The case for tourism promotion: An economic analysis, *Revue de Tourisme*, 47(3), 16‑26.

Dwyer, L. & Forsyth, P. (1993). Assessing the benefits and costs of inbound tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 751-768.

Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P. & Spurr, R. (2004). Evaluating touirsm's economic effects: New and old approaches, *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 307-317.

Eagles, P.F.J. & McCool, S. (2002). Tourism in National Parks and Protected Areas. Wallingford: CABI.

Edgell, D., DelMastro Allen, M., Smith, G & Swanson, J. (2008). Tourism Policy and Planning: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. Oxford: Elsevier.

Elliot, J. (1997). *Tourism: Politics and the Public Sector*. London: Routledge.

Everett, J. & Jamal, T.B. (2004) Multistakeholder collaboration as symbolic marketplace and pedagogic practice, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13(1), 57-78

Farsari, I., Butler, R. & Szivas, E. (2011) Complexity in tourism policies: A cognitive mapping approach, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 38(3), 1110-1134.

Feighery, W. (2010) Consulting ethics, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 1031-1050.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2004). Phronetic planning research: Theoretical and methodological reflections, *Planning Thoery and Practice*, 5(3), 283-306.

Forester, J. (2000). The Deliberative Planning Process: Encouraging participatory Planning Processes. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.

Foucault, M. (1969). *The Archæology of Knowledge*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings. In C. Gordon (Ed.). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Gale, T. (2001). Critical policy sociology: Historiography, archeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis, *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(5), 379-393.

Getz, D. (1983). Capacity to absorb tourism: Concepts and implications for strategic planning, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 10(2), 239-263.

Getz, D. (1986). Models in tourism planning: Towards integration of theory and practice. *Tourism Management,* 7(1), 21-32.

Getz, D. (1987). *Tourism planning and research: Traditions, models and futures*. Paper presented at the The Australian Travel Research Workshop, Bunbury, Western Australia, Bunbury, Western Australia.

Getz, D. (1993). Planning for tourism business districts. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 20(3), 583-600.

Getz, D., & Jamal, T. B. (1994). The environment-community symbiosis: A case for collaborative tourism, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 2, 152-173.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Grimaldi, E. (2012). Analysing policy in the context(s) of practice: A theoretical puzzle, *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(4), 445–465.

Gunn, C. (1972). *Vacationscape: Designing Tourist Regions*. Austin: University of Texas.

Gunn, C. (1988). *Tourism Planning* (Second Edition ed.). New York: Taylor and Francis.

Gunn, C. (1993). *Tourism Planning: Basics, concepts and cases* (3rd Ed.). Washington: Francis and Taylor.

Habermas, J. (1973). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalisation of society* (Vol. 1). Boston: Beacon Press.

Hall, C. M. (1994). *Tourism and Politics: Policy, power and place*. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.

Hall, C. M. (2011). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 19(4/5), 437-457.

Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. (1995). *Tourism and Public Policy*. London: Routledge.

Hall, C.M. & Zapata-Campos, M.J. (2014). Public administration and tourism: International and Nordic perspectives, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 18(1), 3-17

Harvey, D. (2011). The enigma of capital and the crises of capitalism. London: Profile Books.

Haughland, S., Ness, H., Grønseth, B.O. & Aarstad, J. (2010). Development of tourism destinations: An integrated multilevel perspective, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(1), 286-290

Hales, R. and Jamal, T. (2015). Environmental Justice and Tourism. In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and Sustainability*. M. Hall, S. Gössling and D. Scott (eds). London: Routledge, pp. 151-164.

Healey, P. (2006). Relational complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning, *European Planning Studies*, 14(4), 525-546.

Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative Planning*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Henriksen, P. & Halkier, H. (2009). From local promotion towards regional tourism policies: Knowledge processes and actor networks in North Jutland, Denmark, *Europena Planning Studies,* 17(10), 1145-1462.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an "industry": The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management,* 27, 1192-1208.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2008). Justice tourism and alternative globalisation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 16(3), 345-364.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2009). Indigenous ecotourism's role in transforming ecological conciouseness, *Journal of Ecotourism*, 8(2), 144-160.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2011) Death by a thousand cuts: Governance and environmental trade-offs in ecotourism development at Kangaroo Island, South Australia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 553-570.

Hodge, G., & Greve, C. (2010). Public-private partnerships: Governance scheme or language game? *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 69*, S8-S22.

Honey, M., & Gilpin, R. (2009). *Tourism in the Developing World: Promoting peace and reducing poverty*. United States Institute of Peace.

Hultman, J. & Hall, C.M. (2012). Tourism place-making: Governance of locality in Sweden, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 547-570.

Inskeep, E. (1988). Tourism planning: An emerging specialization. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 54(3), 360-372.

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

Jafari, J. (1987). Tourism Models: The sociocultural aspects. *Tourism Management,* 8(2), 151-159.

Jamal, T. and Getz, D. (1996). Does Strategic Planning Pay? Lessons for Destinations from Corporate Planning Experience. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2(1): 59–78.

Jamal, T. & Getz, D. (1999). Community roundtables for tourism-related conflicts: The dialectics of consensus and process structures, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 7(4/4), 290-313.

Jamal, T. and Stronza, A. (2009). Collaboration theory and tourism practices in protected areas: Stakeholders, structuring and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(2): 169–190.

Jamal, T. and McDonald, D. (2011). The Short and Long of Collaborative Planning in the Mountain Resort Destination of Canmore, Canada. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(1): 1–25.

Jamal, T. & Camargo, B. (2014). Sustainable tourism, justice and an ethic of care: Toward the Just Destination, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22:1, 11-30.

Jenkins, C.L. (1980). Tourism policies in developing countries: A critique. *International Journal of Tourism Management*, l (1), 22-29.

Jenkins, J. (1995). A comparative study of tourist organisations in Australia and Canada. *Australian-Canadian Studies,* 13(1), 73-107.

Jenkins, J. (2000). The dynamics of regional tourism organisations in New South Wales, Australia: History, structures and operations, *Current Issues in Tourism,* 3(3), 175-203.

Jenkins, J., & Sorensen, T. (1996). Tourism, regional development and the Commonwealth: A critical appraisal of the regional tourism development program, *Australian Leisure,* 7(4), 28-35.

Jenkins, J., Hall, C.M. & Knono, M. (2014). Tourism and public policy In *The Blackwell Wiley Companion to Tourism*. (pp.542-555). Chichester: Wiley.

Joas, H. and Knöbl, W. (2014). *Social theory twenty introductory lectures*. Cambridge: Camprindge University Press.

Jones, C. O. (1984). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy* (3rd ed.). Monterey: Brooks/Cole.

Kaiser, C. & Helber, L. (1978). *Tourism Planning and Development*. Boston: BCI Publishing.

Kamble, Z. and Bouchon, F. (2014). Tourism planning and a nation's vision: A review of tourism policy in Sri Lanka, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 144, 229-236.

Keogh. B. (1990). Public participation in community tourism planning, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 17, 449-465.

Kerr, B., Barron, G., & Wood, R. C. (2001). Politics, policy and regional tourism administration: A case examination of Scottish area tourist board funding. *Tourism Management,* 22(6), 649-657.

Kozak, M. (2002). Destination benchmarking, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 497-519.

Kozak, M. & Rimmington, M. (1999). Measuring tourist destination competitiveness: Conceptual considerations and empirical findings, *International Journal of Hosptality Management*, 18(3), 273-283.

Kuhn, T.1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Law, J. (2004). *After Method: Mess in social science research*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Lawson, F. (1983). Trends in tourism planning and development, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 3(4), 563-567.

Leiper, N. (1990a). Partial industrialization of tourism systems, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 17, 600-602.

Leiper, N. (1990b). *Tourism Systems: An interdisciplinary perspective* (Occasional Papers ed. Vol. 1990 Number 2). New Zealand: Massey University.

Lickorish, L. (1991). Roles of government and the private sector. In J. Bodlender, A. Jefferson, C. Jenkins & L. Lickorish (Eds.), *Developing Tourism Destinations: Policies and perspectives* (pp.121-142). London: Longman Group.

Luhmann, N. (1995). Social systems (trans. J. Bednarz with D. Baecker. Stanford). Standford: Stanford University Press

Lungren, J. (1973). The development of the tourist travel systems: A metropolitan economic hegemony par excellence? *Tourism Review*, 28(1), 2-14.

Lyotard, J. F. (1979). *The Postmodern Condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Marzuki, A., Hay, I. (2013). Towards a public participation framework for tourism planning, *Tourism Planning and Development*, 10(4), 494-512.

Matthews, H. (1975). International tourism and political science research, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 2(4), 195-203.

Matthews, H. (1978). *International Tourism: A political and social analysis*. Cambridge: Schenkman.

McCool, S. & Moisey, R. N. (2009). *Tourism Rcreation and Sustainability: Linking culture and environment*. CABI: Wallingford.

McIntosh, R. W., & Goeldner, C. R. (1986). *Tourism: Principles, practices and philosophies*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Michael, E. (2001). Public choice and tourism analysis, *Current Issues in Tourism,* 4(2-4), 308-330.

Mill, R. C., & Morrison, A. (Eds.). (1985). *The Tourism System: An introductory text*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Milne, S., & Ateljevic, I. (2001). Tourism, economic development and the global-local nexus: theory embracing complexity, *Tourism Geographies, 3*(4), 369-393.

Mosedale, J. (2011). *Political Economy of Tourism: A Critical Perspective*. Routledge: Abingdon.

Mosedale, J. (2014) Political economy of tourism: Regulation theory, institutions and governance networks. In Hall, C.M. Lew, A.A. and Williams, A.M. (Eds) *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Tourism*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Murphy, P. E. (1988a). Community driven tourism planning. *Tourism Management, 9*(2), 96-104.

Murphy, P. E. (1988b). *Tourism: A community approach*. New York: Methuen.

Nunkoo, R. (2012). Public trust in tourism institutions, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(3), 1538-1564.

Okazaki, E. (2008). A community-based tourism model: Its conception and use, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 16(5), 511-529.

Orbasli, A. & Woodward, S. (2009). Tourism and heritage conservation, in Jamal, T. and Robinson, M. (Eds.) *Handbook of Tourism Studies*. London: Sage.

Outhwaite, W. (2007). Introduction. In Outhwaite, W. and Turner, S. (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Methodology*. (pp.5-6). London: Sage.

Outterson, K., Selinger, E. & Whyte, K. (2012). Justice and policy: Can ethical ideals form the basis of new regulations? *Public Integrity*, 14(1), 39-50.

Padin, C. (2012). A sustainable tourism planning model: Components and relationships, *European Business Review*, 24(6), 510-518.

Pastras, P., & Bramwell, B. (2013). A strategic-relational approach to tourism policy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *43*, 390–414.

Pearce, D. (1996). Federalism and the organization of tourism in Belgium. *European Urban and Regional Studies,* 33, 189-204.

Pforr, C. (2006). Tourism policy in the making: An Australian network study, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1), 87-108.

Reed, M. G. (1997). Power relations and community-based tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 24, 566-591.

Reid, D., Mair, H., & George, W. (2004). Community tourism planning: A self-assessment instrument, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 623-639.

Ren, C., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2010). Constructing tourism research: A critical inquiry. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 37(4), 885-904.

Richins, H., & Pearce, P. (2000). Influences on tourism development decision-making: Coastal local government areas in eastern Australia, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 8(3), 207-231.

Richter, L. K. (1983). Tourism and political science: A case of not so benign neglect, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 10(3), 313-335.

Richter, L. K. (1987). The political dimensions of tourism. In Ritchie J. R. B. & Goeldner, C. R. (Eds.), *Travel Tourism and Hospitality Research* (pp. 215-228). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Ritchie, B.W. (2004). Chaos, crises and distasters, A strategic approach to crisis management in the tourism industry, *Tourism Management*, 25(6), 669-683.

Ruiz-Ballesteros, E. (2011). Socio-ecological resilience and community-based tourism: An approach from Agua Blanca, Equador, *Tourism Management*, 32(3), 655-666.

Rule, J. (1997). *Theory and Progress in Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saarinen, J. (2004). Destinations in change: The transformation process of tourist destinations, *Tourist Studies,* 4(2), 161-179.

Sandercock, L. (1998). *Towards Cosmopolis*. London: Wiley

Scheurich, J. (1994) Policy archaeology: a new policy studies methodology, *Journal of Education Policy*, 9(4), 297-316.

Schon, D. (1980). *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Sharpley, R. (2009). *Tourism Development and the Environment: Beyond sustainability*. London: Earthscan.

Sharpley, R., & Telfer, D. (2008). *Tourism and Development: Concepts and issues*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2004). *Tourism Mobilities: Places to play, places in play*. London: Routledge.

Simmons, D. G. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning, *Tourism Management,* 15(2), 98-108.

Smith, R. (1992). Beach resort evolution: Implications for planning. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 19(3), 304-322.

Spurgin, K. (2006). The sense-making approach and the study of personal information management. In *Personal Information Management*. A SIGIR 2006 Workshop.

Stevenson, N., Airey, D, & Miller, G. (2009). Complexity theory and tourism policy research. *International Journal of Tourism Policy*, 2(3), 206-220.

Swanson, J & Brothers, G. (2012). Tourism policy agenda setting, interest groups and legislative capture, *International Journal of Tourism Policy*, 4(3), 206-221.

Tanguary, G.A., Rajaonson, J. & Therrien, M.C. (2013). Sustainable tourism indicators: Selection criteria for policy, implementation and scientific recognition. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(6), 862-879.

Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries, *Tourism Management*, 21(6), 613-633.

Tosun, C. (2005). Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the developing world, *Geoforum*, 36(3), 333-352.

Truly Sautter, E. & Leisen, B. (1999). Managing Stakeholders: A tourism planning model, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 312-328.

Tyler, D. & Dinan, C. (2001). The role of interest groups in England's emerging tourism policy network, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(2), 210-252.

UNEP. (2003). *Tourism and Local Agenda 21: The role of local authorities in sustainable tourism*. Paris: United Nations Environment Programme & International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives.

Wagner, P. (2010). Successive Modernities and the Idea of Progress: A First Attempt. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 11(2), 9–24.

Wahab, S. & Pigram, J. (1997) Tourism and Sustainability:Policy considerations. In *Tourism Development and Growth: The challenge of sustainability*. London: Routledge. (pp.252-264).

Wang, D. & Ap. J. (2013). Factors affecting tourism policy implementation: a conceptual framework and case study in China, *Tourism Management*, 36, 221-233.

Webb, T. P. (2013). Policy problematization. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education Policy Problematization*, (February).

Weber, M. (2009). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Translated, edited and with an Introduction by Gerth, H. & C.Wright Mills, Abingdon: Routledge.

Woods, E. B. (1907). Progress as a sociological concept, *American Journal of Sociology*, 12(6), 779–821.

Xavier, M., & Alfred, V. (2008). The changing role of governments and the emergence of the relational state, *Corporate Governance*, 8(4), 389.

Zhang, H.Q. & Ap, J. (1999). An analysie of tourism policy development in modern China, *Tourism Management*, 20(4), 417-485.