

Tourism Visioning: Implementing a Primary Stakeholder Approach

Cody Morris Paris, PhD (Corresponding Author)

Senior Lecturer of Social Science

Middlesex University Dubai

And

Senior Research Fellow

University of Johannesburg

South Africa

Knowledge Village, Block 16

PO Box 500697

Dubai, United Arab Emirates

+971 04 433 1776

c.paris@mdx.ac

Richard C. Knopf, PhD

Director, Partnership for Community Development

Professor, School of Community Resources and Development

Arizona State University

411 North Central Avenue, Suite 550

Phoenix, AZ 85004

rknopf@asu.edu

Kathleen Andereck, PhD

Director and Professor

School of Community Resources and Development

Arizona State University

411 North Central Avenue, Suite 550

Phoenix, AZ 85004

kandereck@asu.edu

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Tourism Visioning: Implementing a Primary Stakeholder Approach

Abstract

Following a discussion on the relationship between participatory planning, collaboration, and tourism visioning, this paper describes the development of a tourism specific visioning process. A case study of a facilitated tourism visioning process in the City of Surprise, Arizona, U.S.A. is presented. This case study provides an example of the potential power of the visioning process for a destination community developing a tourism vision to guide collaborative tourism planning. Insights from three stakeholder workshops are discussed in two contexts: (1) a long-term recommendations of what is needed for implementing a successful tourism visioning process and development of a community tourism plan, and (2) a manageable set of short-term “successes” that could be accomplished by stakeholders collaborating to establish a tourism vision.

Keywords: Tourism Planning, Community Development, community goals, case study, capacity building

Introduction

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Community participation in tourism planning and development has gained strong traction during the last twenty years (Murphy, 1985; Simons, 1994; Getz, 1994; Hall, 2008; Tosun, 2006). Emphasis has been put on participatory planning processes that empower community stakeholders to take part in collaborative tourism planning with government entities (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999), rather than ‘top-down’ tourism development (Tosun, 2006). The reality of community tourism planning however is often faced with challenges of unequal power relations among stakeholders, underrepresented community members, lack of control or power for implementing plans, and institutional practices embedded within a society (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999). In most developed countries, and in particular representative democracies, the planning process is often conducted within the legislative structures that already exist. Within these structures community participation is often implicit; however further steps can have been used to further accommodate community input into the tourism planning processes.

Community values, input, and participation in tourism development is important to take into account when evaluating the potential positive and negative impacts of tourism (Murphy, 1988; Murphy, 1985; Wilson, Fesenmaier, Fesenmaier, & Van Es, 2001; Tyrrell, Paris, & Casson, 2010; Tyrrell, Paris & Biaett, 2013; Woodley, 1993). Incorporating community values from the beginning of the planning process can help a community to maximize the potential positive impacts and to minimize the potential negative impacts of tourism development. Thus, the importance of participatory tourism planning is twofold: 1) to empower and involve community stakeholders, thus creating a more democratic form of governance and planning, and 2) to reduce potential tensions between stakeholders during the initial stages of the tourism planning process. The

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

intensity and extent of community participation in the tourism planning process is also an important consideration, particularly during the initial visioning stage. One means of ensuring community participation in the tourism planning process is to involve community stakeholders in the collaborative development of a tourism vision, which will allow future steps of the tourism planning process to be anchored in a agreed upon and constant set of values.

While several tourism studies have acknowledged the importance of tourism visioning exercises for communities, little attention has been given to the implementation of the process for the development of a community's tourism vision. Reid, Mair, and George (2004) suggest that there is a need for studies to consider how community-based approaches are applied to tourism planning, as well as details for other researchers and planners of the implementation of the techniques. The main aim of this paper is to describe the development of a tourism visioning process, and propose practical recommendations based upon a case study in a community in the United States of America. To fulfill this aim, the paper first provides a review of relevant literature on participation, collaboration, and visioning for community based tourism planning. Next, the paper reviews the process and outcomes of a set of three workshops facilitated by the researchers in Surprise, Arizona, and the subsequent planning activities that took place after the consultation. Based upon the researchers' and community stakeholders' interactions a set of long-term and short-term recommendations are elucidated.

Participatory Planning Approaches, Collaboration, and Visioning

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

In order to understand the importance of visioning for tourism, a conceptual understanding of the relationship between participatory planning approaches, stakeholder collaboration, and tourism visioning is needed. In general, greater citizen participation in policy and planning can be seen as a cornerstone to sustainable communities (Cuthill & Fien, 2005), and a component of a broader theoretical framework of participatory democracy (de Tocqueville, 1969). Cuthill (2004) suggests that strong local democracy can contribute to the development of human and social capital, which in turn creates the foundation for collaborative local action. Friedmann (1992) proposes that the empowerment approach, which “places the emphasis on autonomy in decision making of territorially organized communities, local self-reliance, direct (participatory) democracy, and experiential social learning” (p. vii), is crucial for alternative development. With respect to tourism specifically, Tosun and Timothy (2001) suggest community residents are the most aware of local conditions and what will work or not work in their communities. They argue that resident participation in planning can add to democratization and that democracy encourages equity and empowerment by incorporating individual rights. However, in many developed countries, the participation process is institutionalized and ‘legalistic’, where participation is delegated through elected officials. Even when direct participation is implemented, the process can be hijacked by better resourced stakeholders (Hall, 2008). Several challenges for public participation in the tourism planning process were highlighted by Hall (2008) including: difficulty of public in understanding complex and technical planning issues, lack of awareness or understanding, lack of representativeness, general citizen apathy, increased

length and cost, and reduced efficiency (Jenkins, 1993; Singh, Timothy & Dowling, 2003; Murphy & Murphy, 2004).

The inception of participatory methods is generally credited to Friere (1968) who was closely followed by Arnstein (1969) and her concept of ‘ladders of public participation’. Participatory methods have continued to evolve. Activist participatory research (APR) (Chambers, 1994) has been applied in a variety of settings, and it has taken many forms often focusing on the underprivileged or political action. Conceptually, this broad area of research has contributed their ideas to the various and more defined forms of participatory research such as participatory rural appraisal (Chambers, 1994), and comprehensive participatory planning evaluation (Lefevre et al, 2001). APR suggests that local people are capable and creative and can do much of their own investigation, analysis and planning; outsiders can serve as conveners, catalysts and facilitators; and local people, including the marginalized and underprivileged can and should be empowered (Chambers, 1994: 954).

A variety of techniques can be used to implement participatory approaches including semi-structured interviews, key informants, group interviews, oral histories, and livelihood analysis (Chambers, 1994; 2007). Pragmatically, participatory approaches, especially in rural areas, have most often been used with respect to natural resource management, agriculture, poverty and social programs, and health and food security (Chambers, 1994).

Participatory planning is one APR process whereby public stakeholder groups participate in sustainable development planning and implementation. The primary

advantage of participatory planning, as with other participatory approaches, is being able

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

to identify problems and develop solutions based on the knowledge and perspective of local people (Cieigs and Gineitiene, 2008). Chambers (2007) notes that generally, local people will identify more strongly with the outcomes of a process the more participatory it is. Increased buy-in and a higher likelihood and speed of implementation are improved when community residents are empowered through meaningful participation (Cooke and Kothari, 2001).

Uphoff (1992) points out that a systematic approach to problem solving is important in order to focus thought and effort on a few main problems at a time. Discussions are held with households and then with focus groups to discover problems and then develop ideas to solve them. Participation in sustainable development depends on a consultative approach to problem solving. The assumption is that local residents should be seen as partners as they have ideas, skills, insights, and capabilities that are needed for sustainable community planning and development. A study conducted by Ling, Hanna and Dale (2009) affirmed the importance of inclusivity finding that sustainable community development is meaningless without full community engagement early in the process. They found that there is stronger support, partnerships, and effective implementation when there is timely participation and shared decision making. Long term goals defined by the community are more likely to be supported than a plan focused on short term political or economic goals that does not include the local voice.

There is accepted support in the literature for participatory planning approaches in tourism (Reid, Mair, & George, 2004; Haywood, 1988) which emerged out of the activist planning traditions (Timothy, 1999). Murphy (1985) was an early advocate of participatory planning in tourism noting that if tourism planning and development are not

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

consistent with local preferences, the potential resulting negative attitudes toward tourism and tourists can have a detrimental effect on tourism development. His view was shared by other early proponents of citizen involvement (Gunn, 1994; Timothy, 1999; Tosun, 1999).

The participatory tourism planning process is based upon a functional view of the role of tourism in community development. Sautter and Leisen (1999) propose that, ‘the functional view approaches tourism as a proactive force, which if developed appropriately, seeks to maximize positive returns to a community’s overall growth (p. 313).’ Also, they suggest that all stakeholders with an interest in the community should collectively manage the tourism system. Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) suggests that stakeholders are groups or individuals that have either the power to influence performance and/or are affected by the performance. In a tourism planning setting it is vital for there to be stakeholder management capability (Freeman, 1984) so that the various and often conflicting interests of stakeholders can be taken into account. As with the broader participatory planning related literature, Tosun (2000) found that higher levels of community participation in tourism were conducive to the development of sustainable tourism, and in a later study that local people felt a resident committee and local government elected officials in consultation with residents should be the primary decision makers with respect to tourism development (Tosun, 2006). In fact, Tosun and Timothy (2001) comment that lack of community participation in planning is especially common in developing countries due to its implications for distribution of power and resources often results in tourism having little contribution to the objectives of development.

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Often tourism planning decisions are formed and implemented from a regulatory or top-down manner that creates a situation where, “local people and their communities have become the objects of development but not the subjects of it” (Mitchell & Reid, 2001; p. 114). This is particularly true in developing countries, and it can lead to unsustainable tourism development, and the loss of local culture, economic dependency, and degradation of environment (Trousdale, 1999). Timothy (1999) for example, found this to be the case in Indonesia where resident decision making in tourism was nonexistent, as did Tosun and Timothy (2001) with respect to tourism planning and development in Turkey. One role of participatory planning is to avoid this problem and move the role of planners from that of expert knowledge providers toward the role of facilitators or coordinators (Innes, 1998; Ling et al, 2009). Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of citizen participation describes a continuum of participation ranging from non-participation whereby citizen input is not incorporated, to higher rungs where citizens are fully engaged in partnerships, delegated power, and control. These higher rungs encourage meaningful involvement and enhance community social capital (Crawford et al, 2008). Tosun (1999) developed a similar model that is tourism-specific with three stages of citizen involvement: 1) spontaneous participation whereby residents have full managerial responsibility and authority; 2) induced participation whereby residents’ views are heard but they are given no power; and 3) coercive participation whereby power holders impose development on the community. However, it is important to note that the level of direct citizen participation in developed and democratic countries would be somewhat tokenistic in nature according to Arnstein’s (1969) ladder as municipal government is often the body that leads the planning process. On the other hand, we can

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

consider the hierarchical nature of these countries legislative systems. The capacity of local government to lead the planning process, can be seen as a form of community empowerment during which the planning is conducted from within the local community rather of the local community by an external factors and conflicts with regional or national planning processes. The tokenistic relationship between citizens, local government, and the community tourism process is problematic when the process becomes corrupt or blatantly exploitive, contradicts the majority of local residents' values, and is overly influenced by more powerful stakeholders with specific economic interests.

The advance of engagement theory has contributed to the democratization of planning. Ideally, plans are then based on the community-defined socio-economic and environmental context of the community (Ling et al, 2009). A number of tourism researchers have advocated for the involvement of residents in tourism planning (Wang, Yang, Chen, Yang and Li, 2010). Community-based participatory planning is not always successful, however. It can only occur in communities that have the capacity for it to occur (Cuthill & Fien, 2005; Woodley, 1993). Horizontal collaboration among stakeholders with varying interests combined with efforts to build capacities of all participating stakeholders is important, but often a challenging endeavor (Bryson & Crosby, 1992; Innes, 1995; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999). If the capacity for collective action is not there, then collective failure can occur, exacerbating the impacts of decision-making and policy. Michael and Plowman (2002) describe several types of collective failure, including informational, institutional, regulatory, and process failure.

For this paper, an understanding of process failure provides justification of the need for community visioning process within the participatory planning process. Process failure occurs when the process itself fails to deliver an effective and efficient outcome. Stakeholders participating in the planning process each have expectations about the democratic nature of a participatory planning process that the process will incorporate their interest. The expectation for participation in the process must not be corruptible, and any 'false starts' or 'communication slippages' can have dire consequences (Michael & Plowman, 2002). Mere 'cooperation' between stakeholders lacks the complexity of a truly collaborative approach (Jamal & Getz, 1995). Essentially participatory tourism planning can be seen as building the capacity (Getz, 1983) of a community as a tourism destination. Community capacity building is meant to create circumstances in which an approach of working within communities is embraced, and a visionary rather than reactionary perspective is maintained in the tourism planning process. The development of a tourism visioning process is an important part of the building community capacity for tourism planning and development. Because of the complexity of the tourism system an equally complex method of planning needs to be embraced that incorporates a collaborative approach throughout.

Collaboration is "a process of joint decision making among key stakeholders of a problem domain about the future of that domain" (Gray, 1989:227). Based upon Gray's seminal definition of collaboration, Jamal and Getz (1995) proposed that "collaboration for community-based tourism planning is a process of joint decision making among autonomous, key stakeholders of an inter-organizational, community tourism domain to resolve planning problems of the domain and/or to manage issues related to the planning

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

and development of the domain” (p. 188). Gray outlined 5 characteristics of the collaboration process: 1) stakeholders are independent, 2) there is joint ownership in decisions, 3) collective responsibility for the future direction of the domain is assumed by all stakeholders, 4) conflicts are addressed constructively resulting in solutions, and 5) the collaboration process is emergent. A collaborative planning process can involve affected interests in the decision making, enhance communication and understanding among stakeholders, promote institutional reform, and drive the collection and application of information based upon the values of participants; all of which can contribute to a more sustainable future (Williams, Penrose, & Hawkes, 1998). In order to successfully implement a community-based approach to tourism development several barriers must be overcome, including a lack of overall vision for the community (Woodley, 1993). The success of a collaborative participatory process is dependent on the early articulation and identification of goals, community values, and assets through a community visioning process.

Tourism visioning is a process that asks stakeholders to imagine what a community’s tourism development could be at a future date, even if particular resources to achieve that vision do not exist. An integrated community sustainability planning template developed by Ling and others (2009) includes establishing a vision as one of the first step in plan creation. Westley and Mintzberg (1989) summarized visioning as a process composed of three stages: 1) envisioning a future desired ‘stage’, 2) effective communication of vision, and 3) empowering people to be able to enact the vision. A tourism vision can provide a broad strategy enabling the community to adapt to challenges and accommodate change. A clear vision can articulate core values and

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

aspirations, and represents a pattern of values from which an imagined future can develop. Visioning can also help communities learn to map and leverage local assets (Weinberg, 1999).

A tourism vision can contribute to a quasi-bottom-up decision making planning process, and is an essential factor for creating a collaborative effort towards quality destination management (Jamal & Getz, 1997; Trousdale, 1999). The tourism vision of a destination provides a baseline that “will create constancy of purpose and will provide a guidepost for people to determine their own priorities and those of the community effort” (Haywood, 1994: 433).

Jamal and Getz (1997) conducted an exploratory study to examine the visioning exercises of Jackson Hole (Wyoming), Aspen (Colorado), Revelstoke (British Columbia), and Calgary (Alberta). Their investigation showed that the collaborative visioning exercises occurring are often in response to need to manage growth, establish future direction, and/or integrate the needs of multiple stakeholders. The destination vision can provide a continual voice of the sense of place and community that local residents’ desire. Several propositions emerged from Jamal and Getz’s study. First, a well-articulated vision statement provides long-term direction for managing the community’s tourism-related resources. Second, the success of a vision is directly related to the level of stakeholder involvement in the vision formulation process. Third, the tourism visioning exercise is enhanced by ongoing leadership to ensure implementation, monitoring and revision of vision. In communities like the one that is the focus of this paper, the local government often plays a vital role in providing this leadership, as well as protecting the interests of local residents by whom they are elected (Murdoch & Abram, 1998). The

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

importance of the community vision for the long-term planning and success of a destination warrants further examination of the process that leads to the development of a tourism vision.

With the exception of Jamal and Getz's study that compared the visioning process of several destinations through a review of the resulting community visions of the destinations, the community visioning process in tourism has received little attention the literature. It is often mentioned or described as an important part of the tourism planning process (Reid, Mair & George, 2004; Mitchell & Reid, 2001; Trousdale, 1999; Jamal & Getz 1995; Pinel, 1999), but there has not been an in-depth exploration of the tourism visioning process itself. Despite the evidence of the importance of tourism visioning as part of a broader community planning strategy, few communities have gone through tourism visioning exercises. This could be attributed to a lack of capacities including knowledge about the technique and in some instances, an inability to mobilize the resources needed to conduct and implement the visioning process (Weinberg, 1999; Trousdale; 1999). At the same time, several studies in the broader community planning literature have examined the visioning process. Solop (2001) documented the community visioning process in Flagstaff, Arizona using the 'Oregon Model' (Oregon Visions Project, 1993). Several community visioning 'handbooks' have also been developed to provide the tools necessary for the community visioning process (Green, Haines, & Halebsky, 2000). The 'Search Conference' method presented by Emery and Purser (1996) is a useful resource for understanding the visioning process as a method for planning organizational change and community action. While these community visioning

methods have been applied to for general community development plans, there has not been an in-depth discussion of the development of a tourism specific visioning method.

This study presents the development and implementation of a tourism visioning process in the City of Surprise, Arizona, U.S.A. This case study provides an example of the potential power of the tourism visioning process for a destination community developing a community tourism vision to guide collaborative tourism planning exercise.

Background of the Community

The City of Surprise, Arizona, is a small city located in northwestern metropolitan Phoenix. The city is one of the fastest growing in the United States over the last two decades, expanding from a population of just over 7000 people in 1990 to nearly 31000 in 2000. In 2012 the population neared 120,000 people. While a variety of tourism amenities existed at the time of the visioning process (including regional desert parks, sports facilities, spring training games, museums, lodging, restaurants, special events, and proximity to planned communities that draw tremendous numbers of winter visitors), no plan existed to build collaborations among the tourist providers, coordinate marketing efforts, brand the City for tourism, and chart pathways for future tourism development. City officials wanted to create a vision for a process that would successfully lead to the development of a strategic tourism plan.

In 2004, the City developed the *Surprise Focused Future II Strategic Plan for Community and Economic Development* (City of Surprise, 2004), providing the first formal platform for considering the role of tourism as an economic and life quality driver its development. It articulated that the goal of the development effort for the City of

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Surprise must be to “build infrastructure to support new business growth”, “develop strategy to diversify the economy while helping current businesses thrive”, “create a more entrepreneurial environment”, “evolve quality of life”, and “identify and target quality businesses based upon what Surprise can support”.

Throughout the *Plan*, tourism is implicated for its potential power in advancing the economic development agenda. For example, a sector identified as the “recreation-related, entertainment and arts/culture support business” sector was identified as one of five core sectors to catalyze and ensure positive economic growth. An “immediate” strategy identified in the *Plan* was to “develop a master plan for visitor destination development” and to develop a “recreation and entertainment marketing plan for the City of Surprise”. As such strategies were articulated, the *Plan* mandated the City to “develop policy that encourages and supports economic development”, “develop planning that supports a sustainable community”, “involve residents and stakeholders in decision-making”, and “support and coordinate with other local and regional organizations as they relate to economic development”. In the case of Surprise, the desired tourism visioning process would provide a means of supporting the city’s wider economic development plan.

In light of the mandates of the *Plan*, the purpose of the collaboration between the researchers and the City of Surprise was to create conversations among a broad range of representatives from stakeholder groups in the community (from business, government, non-profit and culture organizations) to build a capacity for establishing a *vision* for tourism development for the community. In this case, the researchers acted as outside facilitators (Friedmann, 1992). The process included a set of three half-day *strategic*

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

visioning workshops during the summer of 2005. The goal of the workshops was to create a visioning process that would ultimately lead to the development of a vision to guide the development of the City's master plan for visitor destination management, and the City's marketing plan for tourism, recreation and entertainment. The visioning process identified a strategy for developing sustainable and impactful tourism that maximized economic cash-flow for businesses, and the quality of life for citizens of Surprise.

The workshops were designed to engage stakeholders from many disparate community sectors – small businesses and large businesses, direct tourism service providers and those who indirectly benefit from tourist activity, hospitality services and parks and recreation managers, special event managers and attractions managers, financial management organizations and arts and cultural organizations, new home builders and long-term residents, special interest organizations and government agencies. The intent was to create a platform, through these workshops, to develop dialogue among sectors that characteristically do not have strong pathways for inter-communication and collaboration about their common interests in developing sustainable tourism development within the community. The use of these 'working groups' is reflective of the reality of collaborative policymaking (Brandon, 1993). The dialogue within this platform would allow for trust, consensus building, collective learning, and mutual learning, thus overcoming some of the divisions among the various stakeholder groups (Friedmann, 1992). Ultimately, the objective of the City was to encourage conversations that would begin movement within the community toward the goal of producing a master plan and marketing plan for tourism development.

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Facilitated Tourism Visioning Workshops

The facilitated tourism visioning workshops centered on a series of three stakeholder workshops with representatives of four core sectors: business, government, non-profit and culture. The workshops were constructed to gain stakeholder perspective on seven general domains as well as to determine areas in which the stakeholders would need to develop further capacities for implementing a tourism visioning process and subsequent development of a tourism plan:

- Existing community assets around which effective tourism could be built.
- Core tourism “drivers” that underlie the unique type of consumer demand that would be attracted to Surprise community assets.
- Potentially unique “marketing niches” or “product portfolios” in light of competitive mixes in surrounding communities.
- Potential community assets that could be assembled to further advance these niches through creative and entrepreneurial relationships among community partners.
- Important elements of an effective tourism development strategy
- Processes that need to develop an effective community vision for tourism
- Elements of a practical plan to ensure that the community achieves this vision

Following focus group protocol (Krueger & Casey, 2000), each workshop followed pre-determined scripts. These probes were developed with input from City of Surprise officials. The scripts were designed to generate conversation that would provide

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

perspective in each of the above seven domains. A myriad of sub-questions were developed to guide the conversations in each of three Workshops for the ultimate purpose of gleaning perspective about these domains. True to standard protocol of focus group methods, the many sub-questions were not intended -- and therefore were not used -- to create a linear, structured question and answer format. Specific group chemistry dictated how the questions were utilized to guide the participants into generating perspectives across all seven domains.

The workshops were all facilitated by two university tourism faculty members. Workshops I and II focused on creating conversations around six topical areas that were construed by city officials as six forms of needed perspective before the full articulation of a tourism vision could begin. These were:

- Existing community assets that are valued by residents
- Existing community assets that would be attractive to tourists
- Other regional assets that Surprise could capitalize upon
- Kinds of consumers that might be attracted to these assets
- Potential for unique “market niches” that the community might offer to expand tourism
- Whom should be involved in the development of a tourism vision (sectors, organizations, citizens)

Formal invitations to invitees from the four targeted sector groups were mailed by City officials. The invitees were selected by the researchers in collaboration with the City Economic Development Director. While a diverse group of participants was invited, as with any qualitative research, the results cannot be generalized and are the opinions and Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

ideas of the participants. While participants were all representatives of diverse stakeholder groups in the community, they cannot be seen as completely representative of wider local views (Shorthall, 1994). Workshops I and II were identical, with Workshop I targeting representatives from fifteen government, nonprofit and arts and culture organizations and Workshop II targeting fifteen representatives from the business community. In total, then, thirty tourism stakeholders participated in one of the two workshops.

A nucleus of the tourism stakeholders returned for Workshop III, along with other invitees as identified in the “whom should be involved” component of the first two workshops. This critical mass of tourism stakeholders were led through a process that culminated in articulation of the future strategy for establishing a tourism vision. Twenty-six stakeholders, representing a broad mix of sectors, organizations and residents participated in this workshop. The stakeholders that participated in the workshops represent those that would be vital for the implementation of the resulting tourism plan, which is vital to the success of the process (Benveniste, 1989).

Workshop III began with a tutorial that framed for the participants, core elements of an effective tourism development strategy. This model, with its origins in the work of Green and Haines (2002), describes the six fundamental steps to developing an effective tourism development strategy:

- Conduct a Situation Analysis (Environmental Audit)
- Select Specific Target Market(s)
- Position the Product/Service
- Determine Marketing Objectives

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

- Develop and Implement Action Plans
- Monitor and Evaluate Actions

After providing a general overview of these six steps in the model, the workshop facilitators gave details of specific information needs that are required for each step in the process. Stakeholders in the third workshop were then led through a template that incorporated insights generated from Workshops I and II into the model as a basis for creating the tourism vision during Workshop III. Then, the group was facilitated through a focus group process by using a script designed to generate conversation in three general domains:

- Long-term direction needed to facilitate successful tourism development
- Short-term “successes” that could be accomplished by stakeholders working together
- Specific sectors that need to be engaged as the tourism development strategy is developed

The following sections present the results of the focus group workshops in a way that guides tourism stakeholders to a process for developing a tourism vision and a strategic tourism development plan.

Workshops I and II: Setting the Stage for a Visioning Process

The core results of Workshops I and II are presented below, organized around the six topical areas that guided the conversations.

Community Assets Valued by Participants

The first set of focus group questions asked participants to identify core community assets that defined the quality of life for Surprise residents. The suggestion was that the very assets that residents value are likely not only to be used as a foundation for defining the destination portfolio for potential tourism, but also should be protected and enhanced as a vision for tourism is developed.

In general, the participants described Surprise as a community offering a sense of newness and expanding opportunity with a small town feel. Participants noted that the community is treasured for its abundance of open space, a semi-rural flavor, and proximity to mountainous settings. It carries an image of forward movement, excitement, freshness, cleanliness, diversity, and affordability. There is a strong sense of community, with friendly, authentic people and accessible city leaders. There is a sense of pride about the prevalence of volunteer work. It is seen as a relatively safe community. Participants suggested that all of these values could coalesce to define a unique, marketable image to assist in the differentiation of Surprise from other tourism environments within the Phoenix metropolitan area.

Other Surprise Assets Capable of Attracting Tourists

The second set of questions focused on identifying Surprise assets that would be particularly appealing to tourists. The participants noted the potential drawing power of the Surprise sports and recreational facilities. Also mentioned were the opportunities for

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

general recreation activity, special events, golf courses, desert and mountain backdrops, open space, rich history and cultural fabric of the City, arts and culture organizations, overtones of Southwest culture in general, and weather. The fast growth of the City – including fast growth of the retirees and the senior housing market -- was seen as fuel for attracting business travelers, the family and friends market, and the home prospector market. Existing business sectors, such as the proving grounds, hospital and health care industry and agriculture were seen as potential tourism magnets.

Regional Assets that Surprise Could Capitalize Upon

The third set of questions asked participants to identify numerous regional assets that could be incorporated into Surprise tourism development strategy and tourism. These assets included a local air force base, the zoo, an art museum, shopping and nightlife, and meeting and convention space. A regional county natural park and other regional outdoor recreation resources offering nature walks, hiking, mountain biking, camping, horseback riding, nature-oriented pleasure drives, and off-road vehicle riding were also identified by the focus groups as being appealing to many tourists. The focus group participants suggested that the City was positioned well to partner with the areas sports, recreation and special event venues. The growth of the neighboring parts of the metropolitan area could be capitalized upon as an asset for tourism. The transportation networks through the western metropolitan area, though under-resourced within the City of Surprise proper, could be leveraged to provide easy access from other areas of the state and metropolitan area.

Needs of Tourists

The fourth set of questions asked participants to identify the needs that tourists might carry as they considered Surprise as a tourism alternative. Common themes included: ease of transportation and access, good parking, entertainment options, nightlife/evening activities, special events, golf, attractions, conventions and meeting space, fine dining opportunities, resort amenities, and shopping and theatre complexes. There was a clear sense that further infrastructure development is needed within surprise to support these needs.

The Potential for a Unique “Marketing Niche” or “Tourism Product Portfolio”

The fifth set of questions invited participants to imagine what might be particularly effective market niches to target in a Surprise tourism development and marketing strategy. This was cited as a particularly important goal, given the need for Surprise to differentiate itself from the myriad of relatively similar communities with campaigns of their own. Importantly, the need was recognized to build product portfolios that would offer multiple “benefit bundles” to particular target segments. Table 1 summarizes the marketing niches and product bundles that emerged from the workshops. Many participants in the process were intrigued to consider the notion of Surprise adopting a multi-asset packaging to target specific, potential markets.

INSERT TABLE 1

The sixth set of questions asked the participants to reflect upon the kinds of stakeholder groups that need to be involved in the process of defining the Surprise tourism vision – the focus of the third workshop to follow. The participants recognized that the tourism system is rich, complex, and varied, and the impacts permeate throughout the fabric of the community. In addition to the repertoire of stakeholders already invited to the workshops (tourism businesses, government, non-profit organizations, and arts and culture organizations), participants suggested several other sectors that need representation. These include: the proving grounds, local foundations, sports facilities from throughout the metropolitan area, faith-based organizations, historians, land developers, home builders, public information officers, chamber of commerce, home owner associations, schools, and media. As the discussion unfolded, participants offered several suggestions for developing strategies for coalescing a community vision for tourism development, which were incorporated into the structure of the third workshop that focused entirely on creating and framing the visioning process.

Workshop III: Coalescing a Tourism Visioning Process

As noted above, insights from the first two workshops were synthesized and reported in the context of the six-step Tourism Development Cycle framework. This provided a useful starting point for building the collective community visioning process. It not only enabled the participants to envision anchor points for building the vision, but also to take note of specific issues and questions in the six-step cycle that remained unaddressed and unexplored. Lack of insight abounded for many issues within the first

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

three steps (*Situation Analysis, Selection of Target Market(s), and Positioning of Product/Service*). The facilitators noted that without complete development of perspective for these first three steps, stakeholders may not possess the capacity to complete the last three steps (*Determining Market Objectives, Developing and Implementing Action Plans, and Developing Monitoring and Evaluation Strategies*).

Once this process was completed, participants were asked to ponder upon the information presented, and coalesce a process for developing a vision for tourism development in their community.

Reflection on Implications of the Exercise

To assess how successful this collaborative exercise was, it is important to reflect upon the processes and outcomes that have developed since the facilitated workshops took place in 2005. The researchers were not involved in these activities. The knowledge and capacities developed during the collaboration in 2005 are evident in several key developments that have taken place. On April 14, 2009 the Surprise Tourism Committee (later renamed the Tourism Advisory Commission) was established with the mandate of advising the City Council on Tourism and to develop a strategic plan for the development of tourism in Surprise. Starting in late April 2009, the Tourism Advisory Commission (TAC) began the planning process with a series of five monthly planning meetings. They developed a vision for tourism (Tourism Advisory Commission, 2009 p. 3):

*Surprise is to be a place where people come to embrace history, culture, and entertainment in a way that differentiates Surprise from neighboring cities. The City of Surprise should be known as the place for **Experiential***

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Tourism (original emphasis). Even the city's residents will be surprised by how much their city has to offer.

Along with the community tourism vision, they also produced a five year strategic tourism plan to guide the committees activities from 2010-2015 (Tourism Advisory Commission, 2009). Within this plan the TAC presented a series of short-term goals and objectives with a focus on four key areas for attracting more tourists to the city. First, they emphasized the need to develop a central entertainment corridor, expand on current recreational facilities including the tennis complex and recreation center, develop an annual festival framework, locate a conference center in the city, and identify a year round attraction. All of these are important as currently, the majority of tourist expenditures come during Spring Training baseball, as Surprise is the host of two major league baseball teams for a two month period in February and March.

The second key goal was to enhance local and regional partnerships. First they noted the need to create partnerships with hotel associations, arts organizations, non-baseball sports organizations, and other tourism and commercial entities in order to offer visitors a wider range of non-baseball activities. The plan also presented the objective of establishing public/private self-sustaining partnerships within the Surprise area including: casino and Indian tribal communities, third party promoters, other West Valley cities in the Phoenix metropolitan area, transportation industry, Luke Air Force Base, and travel agencies. The partnership goal also included objectives to establish an interactive visitor center in collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce and to develop a hospitality training partnership in order to improve customer service and increase repeat visitation.

The third key goal area of the plan was to create a world-class luxury experience in Surprise by positioning the City as a viable ground for resort development. The plan includes the objective attracting a major world class luxury destination resort and year round entertainment attraction collocated on a 500 acre site at the foothills of White Tank Mountains by working with city, county, and state officials. The final key goal was to develop the Surprise and the White Take Mountains as a gateway to the ‘Arizona Experience’. To do this, the plan notes that they need to partner with the State of Arizona and Maricopa county to preserve the open space surrounding the White Tank Regional Park. They would also work with the state, county, and federal Bureau of Land management to create a ‘Living Museum’ and interpretive center at the White Tanks, and would work to establish the White Tanks as a ‘unique desert eco-park destination.’ Further, the plan calls for the development of a multi-purpose amphitheater to be used as a setting for big gatherings, festivals and performances.

Since establishing the plan in 2009, the TAC and the City of Surprise have made progress towards their goals and objectives. In addition the specific goals laid out in the strategic plan, several other important developments have also been undertaken that have a basis of the workshops conducted in 2005. One of the first actions of the Tourism Committee took in January 2010 after finalizing the strategic plan, was to pass through a 1.52% increase in the bed-tax to provide funds solely for the promotion and marketing of tourism in Surprise. The TAC has also continued to incorporate the communities voice in advising the City Council as it is made up of business leaders, non-profit and cultural leaders, and others noted only as ‘citizens’ on the commission’s roster. Additionally, the TAC has done a good job of recognizing when they need further insight, and on

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

numerous occasions invited outside experts to meet with the TAC on specific topics and issues. Finally, the TAC has done a good job of working with other entities within the city government to ensure that the necessary lines of communication are present for advancing the strategic tourism plan.

The updated Surprise Tourism Advisory Commission message illuminates the confidence and focus of the commission, city leaders, and the community has towards accomplishing the goal of furthering the development of tourism in a meaningful way for Surprise (Tourism Advisory Commission, 2013):

The promotion and expansion of tourism in Surprise is one of the primary goals of the Tourism Advisory Commission. Surprise is poised to present a "unique" local flavor that will sustain the community while capturing the tourism element to improve its return on investment in quality programs and services. Economic activity in Surprise will be enhanced as we infuse tourism dollars into the local economy. Tourism is a natural extension to enhance the work that has already been done at the local and regional level.

Surprise developed rapidly, and now, as we enter a new and exciting phase of sustainability and progress in the development of our tourism industry; we are exquisitely aware of the consumer climate. Our marketing approach and end products must be based on consumer feedback, which call for high levels of service, value and uniqueness.

The Surprise Tourism Advisory Commission is committed to pursuing the key results areas using the strategies outlined in this five year plan which emphasizes collaborative industry partnerships, entertainment corridors, establishing the viability of a resort in Surprise while preserving the natural amenity of the White Tanks, and promoting Surprise as the gateway to the Western Heritage Trail.

The success of Surprise in developing a community vision and strategic tourism plan, as well as the success they have had in implementing the plan thus far can be attributed to the community's capacity and knowledge regarding the visioning process, as well as the Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

hard work and dedication of community's leaders and residents. The collaboration between the researchers and the community was only a small stepping stone in the communities overall journey towards developing Surprise as a tourism destination.

Recommendations

Based upon the dialogues during the three workshops and the resulting implementation of the tourism visioning process in Surprise, several key themes for the long term success of the community participatory planning process for tourism can be elucidated. A summary of the emerging themes includes:

1. *Multi-stakeholder collaboration.* Tourism must be recognized as a complex economic and life quality engine that carries impacts within diverse segments of the community. As such, long term planning needs to involve representatives from many stakeholder groups working in collaboration to achieve a long term and unifying goal.
2. *Cooperative marketing ventures.* There needs to be a coherent marketing strategy for the community, and opportunities for cooperative marketing of multiple tourism assets, products and services. This will result in greater visibility of Surprise as a tourism destination, more attractive and “bundled” tourism benefit portfolios to target markets, and economies of scale in tourism promotion.
3. *A research-driven strategy.* While insights about the consumer, Surprise tourism products, and the competitive environment abound, it is clear that objective research is needed. There are many unknowns about the decision-making

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

process of tourists, and how competing tourism destinations successfully develop marketing campaigns to increase tourism-related cash flow in their local economies.

4. *Regional alliances.* Surprise cannot be successful in the highly competitive tourism market operating in isolation of other West Valley communities and surrounding tourism assets. As tourism marketing and development strategy unfolds, it needs to be done in the context of a regional perspective. Representatives of other communities and tourism assets need to be incorporated into the visioning process.
5. *Leadership for tourism development.* A focal point for leadership needs to be identified, and clear organization and resources need to surround this focal point.
6. *Strategic partnerships between Surprise city government and the business community.* Implicit in the leadership development process is the need to develop synchrony between the interests of business and the resources of city government. Working together, the potential for developing strategically targeted, successful tourism-related economic and life quality initiatives would be greatly increased.
7. *Creation of an explicit, long-term strategic plan for tourism development.* A tourism plan detailing mission, vision, environmental assessments, trends, goals, objectives, action plans and evaluation strategies must be written. The plan must reflect the interests of a broad range of community stakeholders, including citizens who must have their interests for an ideal community reflected. The

plan should guide the development of marketing, and the cultivation of new assets with the power of attracting desired tourism flow.

8. *The tourism product(s) must be defined.* In order to compete in the marketplace, the specific “unique selling proposition” for surprise tourism must be explicitly defined. This definition includes specification of desired target markets, and articulation of specific “product portfolios” that will be captured in marketing campaigns to position and differentiate the community as a unique and lucrative destination for the target market.
9. *A strategy for tourism infrastructure development.* The attractive draw of the community for tourists can be challenged by the lack of infrastructure that tourists deem important. Examples include: major resorts, nightlife, attractions, and efficient transit systems. An important element of tourism vision development must include creation of a specific plan for assessing needed infrastructure, and an action plan for developing it.
10. *Transit and access.* A specific strategy and action plan must be developed to address the community challenges of access and transit. Regionally, the community must position itself as readily accessible to tourism markets internally, nationally, state-wide and within the wider regional area. Internally, transit systems are required to connect tourism assets, products and services within the community. Parking and traffic problems need to be removed as barriers to the promotion of tourism.
11. *Barriers to tourism development.* There are many forces that undermine the development of a coherent tourism strategy beyond limited infrastructure. Lack

Authors’ Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

of leadership, inadequate communication among stakeholders, lack of vision, lack of information on best practices, and other limitations thwart progressive movement in the tourism arena. These barriers need to be inventoried, and a strategy for overcoming them needs to be developed.

12. *Gateway for tourism.* There needs to be both a psychological and physical focal point for community tourism activity. The purpose of this focal point is to serve as a beacon for attracting tourists to the community, and to provide a mechanism for grounding tourists in local assets and opportunities once they arrive. This focal point could be developed physically through construction of a tourist visitor center, or the encouragement of multiple tourism assets to assemble in one geographic local (such as the local sports and entertainment district).

13. *Promotional items to communicate existing tourism assets.* There is a need for a coordinated promotional plan that communicates existing tourism assets to both stakeholders (so cross-promotions can transpire) and tourists.

14. *Branding for promotion and marketing.* In the context of tourism promotion, there is a need for a research-based branding initiative, which includes the development of a logo, slogan, an orchestrated set of positioning statements, and templates for ads and collateral development. The branding should capitalize on any unique characteristics of the community.

15. *Begin with a focus on small successes.* It is important to recognize the complexity of the task ahead. The broader outcomes will be accomplished only after significant investment of time and resources. It is important to allow for the production of immediate, bounded, limited scope achievements to provide

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

encouragement for those engaged in the process, for example: development of a tourism-oriented web-site, social media presence, and monthly calendar of events.

The workshops also offered specific suggestions on how a community can move forward in achieving a vision for tourism in the short-term. First, there needs to be an ongoing schedule of meetings of stakeholders. Regularly scheduled meetings would capitalize upon the energy and forward movement. The meetings would provide a platform for open expression of interests of community stakeholders, and a mechanism for building collaboration among them. To facilitate this process, the identification of leadership *via* a task force created to evaluate scenarios for developing individuals and organizations that might provide leadership for tourism development within the community. Along with a designated lead individual or organization, a tourism development task force is formally designated, and charged to create forward movement in the creation of a tourism development plan.

Additionally, for short term success, the development of a standardized template for creating promotional and informational materials for visitors would be essential. Even in absence of a permanent brand and logo, the template would ensure consistency and quality among otherwise disparate promotional activities of stakeholders. To obtain the most value for dollars spent, placement of initial cross-marketing advertisements could be facilitated by pooling the marketing resources of various stakeholders to place a limited number of more impactful, strategic advertisements in local tourist-oriented media.

Conclusion

The main purpose of this paper was to present a case study of the collaboration between the researchers and stakeholders in Surprise, Arizona. Three facilitated workshops examined current capacities of the community and areas where further capacity needed to be built in order for the community to develop a tourism vision and strategic plan. While the exercise provided some important insights for the community, the resulting recommendations should be help other communities undertaking this community-based tourism planning. This paper also contributes a case study of a community located in a developed country with a institutionalized legislative planning process, and provides some insights into the realities of community participation in the planning processes within these systems.

Based upon this study, several future research directions are evident. While, the tourism visioning process presented in this paper and the subsequent success of the community building upon this process can provide useful insights for similar communities in search of methods for crystallizing the necessary steps for creating a systematic community-based tourism development plan, in communities like Surprise, the level of resident cooperation is often tokenistic. Research into inclusive techniques that can be used to involve a larger number of local residents within these legislative planning systems are needed (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999). Collaborative participatory planning empowers stakeholders to be involved in decision-making, suggested by the literature as an essential feature of long-term planning that result in sustainable positive outcomes for the community. The nature of these collaborations needs to be further explored, in particular the representativeness of the stakeholders, unequal power relations

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

between stakeholder groups, and the practical necessity of participation of stakeholders and community residents in a tourism planning process within communities in developed and democratic societies.

Future research should seek to examine the long-term success and failures in implementing community visions in tourism, as the community visioning process is only a part of a the strategic planning process, a greater understanding of the transition between vision and action in the long term is needed. Also, multi-cultural and multi-national comparisons should be conducted to examine the role of community visioning in other settings. Li (2006) argues that active local participation in decision-making is a generally western paradigm that might not hold up in other cultural, social, and/or political settings. Nonetheless, the process reflected here has indeed created the locus of community buy-in that will certainly create the apparatus necessary for the City of Surprise to grow appropriate niche tourism development in an increasingly competitive metropolitan environment.

References

Arnstein, S.R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 4, pp. 216-224.

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

Brandon, K. (1993). Basic steps toward encouraging local participation in nature tourism projects. In K. Lindberg and D.E. Hawkins (Eds) *Ecotourism: A Guide for Planners and Managers*, pp. 134-151, The Ecotourism Society: North Bennington.

Bryson, J.M. and Crosby, B.C. (1992). *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Chambers, R. (2007). *Who Counts? The Quiet Revolution of Participation and Numbers*. Brighton UK: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Chambers, R. (1994). The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal. *World Development* 22(7), pp. 953-969.

Ciegis, R. and Gineiteine, D. (2008). Participatory aspects of strategic sustainable development planning in local communities: Experience of Lithuania. *Technological and Economic Development* 14(2), pp. 107-117.

City of Surprise. (2004). *Surprise Focused Future II Strategic Plan for Community and Economic Development*. www.surpriseaz.com/documentview.asp?DID=1964

Cooke, B and Kothari, U. (eds.) (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Crawford, P., Kotval, Z., Rauhe, W. and Kotval, Z. (2008). Social capital development in participatory community planning and design. *Town Planning Review* 79(5), pp. 533-553.

Cuthill, M. (2004). Community Visioning: Facilitating informed citizen participation in local area planning on the Gold Coast. *Urban Policy and Research* 22(4), pp. 427-445.

Cuthill, M. and Fien, J. (2005). Capacity building: Facilitating citizen participation in local governance. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64(4), pp. 63-80.

de Toqueville, A. (1969) *Democracy in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Emery, M. and Purser, R. (1996). *The search conference: A powerful method for planning organizational change and community action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Freeman, R. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: The Seabury Press.

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

- Friedmann, J. (1992). *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Getz, D. (1983) Capacity to Absorb Tourism: Concepts and Implications for Strategic Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10, pp. 239-263.
- Getz, D. (1994). Resident's attitudes towards tourism: A longitudinal study in Spey Valley, Scotland. *Tourism Management*, 15(4), pp. 247-258.
- Gunn, C.A. (1994). *Tourism Planning: Basics, Concepts, Cases* (3rd ed.). Washington DC: Taylor and Francis.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multi-Party Problems* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Green, G., Haines, A., and Halebsky., S. (2000). *Building Our Future: A Guide to Community Visioning* (Report No. G3708) (Madison: University of Wisconsin Extension Publications).
- Hall, C.M. (2008). *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Haywood, K.M. (1988). Responsible and Responsive Tourism Planning in the Community. *Tourism Management* 9, pp. 105-118.
- Innes, J. E. (1995). Planning theory's emerging paradigm: Communicative action and interactive practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14, pp. 183-190.
- Innes, J.E. (1998). Information in communicative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 64, pp. 52-63.
- Jamal, T. and Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration Theory and Community Tourism Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22(1), pp. 186-204.
- Jenkins, J. Tourism policy in rural New South Wales: Policy research priorities. *Geojournal*, 29(3), pp. 281-290.
- Krueger, R. and Casey, M.A. (2000) *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research* (London: Sage).
- Lefevre, P., Kolsteren, P., DeWael, M., Byekwaso, F. and Beghin, I. (2001). *Comprehensive Participatory Planning Evaluation*. Rome: U.N. International Fund for Agriculture Development.

- Li, W. (2006) Community Decisionmaking: Participation in Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1), pp. 132-143.
- Ling, C., Hanna, K., and Dale, A. (2009). A template for integrated community sustainability planning. *Environmental Management* 44, pp. 228-242.
- Michael, E. and Plowman, G. (2002) Mount Stirling: The Politics of Process Failure. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 10(2), pp. 154-169.
- Mitchell, R. and Reid, D. (2001) Community Integration: Island Tourism in Peru. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(1), pp. 113-139.
- Murdoch, J. and Abram, S. (1998). Defining the limits of community governance. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14, pp. 41-50.
- Murphy, P.E. (1985) *Tourism: A Community Approach* (New York: Methuen).
- Murphy, P. (1988) Community Driven Tourism Planning. *Tourism Management* 9(2), pp. 96-104.
- Murphy, P. E. and Murphy, A. E. (2004). *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Pinel, D. (1999) Create a Good Fit: A Community-Based Tourism Planning Model. In M. Miller, A. Jan, and N. Hadley (Eds) *Proceedings of the 1999 International Symposium on Coastal and Marine tourism: Balancing Tourism and Conservation, Vancouver British Columbia, April 2009*, pp. 277-286.
- Reid, D., Mair, H., and George, W. (2004) Community Tourism Planning: A Self-Assessment Instrument. *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(3), pp. 623-639.
- Sautter, E. and Leisen, B. (1999) Managing Stakeholders: A Tourism Planning Model. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(2), pp. 312-328.
- Shorthall, S. (1994). The Irish rural development paradigm: An exploratory analysis. *Economic and Social Review*, 25, pp. 233-60.
- Simons, D. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15(2), pp. 98-108.
- Singh, S., Timothy, D., and Dowling, R. (2003). *Tourism in Destination Communities*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Solop, F. (2001) Survey Research and 'Visioning' in Flagstaff, Arizona. *Planning Practice & Research* 16(1), pp. 51-58.
- Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Timothy, D. (1999). Participatory planning: A view of tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(2), pp. 371-391.

Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism Management* 27, pp. 493-504.

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

Tosun, C. (1999). Towards a typology of community participation in the tourism development process. *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality* 10, pp. 113-134.

Tosun, C. and Timothy, D.J. (2001). Shortcomings in planning approaches to tourism development in developing countries: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 13(7), pp. 352-359.

Tourism Advisory Commission. (2009). *Tourism Five Year Strategic Plan*. Retrieved February 15, 2013, from <http://www.surpriseaz.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/5367>

Tourism Advisory Commission. (2013). *Surprise Tourism Advisory Commission*. Retrieved February 15, 2013, from <http://www.surpriseaz.gov/index.aspx?nid=2275>

Trousdale, W. (1999) Governance in Context: Boracay Island, Philippines. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(4), pp. 840-867.

Tyrrell, T., Paris, C., & Biaett, V. (*in press*). A quantified triple bottom line for tourism: Experimental Results. *Journal of Travel Research*.

Tyrrell, T., Paris, C. & Casson, M. (2010). Evaluating tourism community preferences. *Tourism Analysis*, 15, 121-124.

Uphoff, N. (1992). *Local Institutions and Participation for Sustainable Development*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.

Wang, H., Yang, Z., Chen, L., Yang, J, and Li, R. Minority community participation in tourism: A case of Kanas Tuva villages in Xinjiang, China. *Tourism Management* 31, pp. 759-764.

Weinber, A. (1999) The University and the Hamlets: Revitalizing Low-Income Communities Through University Outreach and Community Visioning Exercises. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(5), pp. 800-813.

Authors' Pre-Print Draft of paper for personal use. All references should be made to the definitive version published in *Tourism Review International*, 17(4), 267-282.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427214X13910101597201>

Westley, F. & Mintzberg, H. (1989). Visionary leadership and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 17-32.

Williams, P., Penrose, R., and Hawkes, S. (1998) Shared Decision-Making in Tourism Land Use Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25(4), pp. 860-889.

Wilson, S., Fesenmaier, D., Fesenmaier, J., and Van Es, J. (2001) Factors for Success in Rural Tourism Development. *Journal of Travel Research* 40, pp. 132-138.

Woodley, A. (1993) Tourism and Sustainable Development: The Community Perspective. In J. Nelson, R. Butler, and G. Wall (Eds) *Tourism and Sustainable Development: Monitoring, Planning, and Managing*, pp. 135-147. Waterloo: Department of Geography, University of Waterloo.

Table 1. Potential tourism market niches and product bundles for Surprise, AZ.

<i>Effective Market Niches</i>	<i>Potential Product Bundles</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southwest desert experience • Sports and recreation • Friends and family travel packages • Multi-generational marketing for families and extended families • Golf packages • Business traveler and convention packages • Snow bird packages • Housing and job relocation market packages • Special events packages – particularly those with potential for regional draw • Arts, cultural, and history packages • Attractions packages (e.g., Speed World) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events/festivals/sports/recreational packaging • African / Native American / Hispanic arts, culture and history packaging • Natural environment packaging – cactus, flowers, open space, mountain vistas, outdoor recreation opportunities • Family-oriented packaging – attractions, sports facilities, shopping, recreation areas • Clustering assets for high spending tourists – sports, arts, culture, natural environment, attractions