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Toward Integrative Tourism Planning in Rural America

David W. Marcouiller

There is a need to develop planning frameworks that address tourism development within the broader context of community or regional development goals in rural areas of the United States. An integrative approach is one such framework that entails careful assessment of economic, social, and environmental impacts of tourism relative to other development strategies. This review takes a historical perspective of rural tourism planning progress. Core concepts of an integrative approach are collaborative planning with the affected stakeholders and the assessment of specific planning issues that foster integration of tourism with overall regional development. The application of more integrative frameworks allows planners to improve the manner in which rural tourism development occurs.

In rural areas, tourism has become an important public policy issue because of limited development options, increased public expenditures for promotion, increased local pressures for resultant public services, increased conflict among user groups, and general concerns over societal costs and benefits of public support for tourism development. Tourism as a major component of rural economic development strategies is on the rise because of increases in tourism demand, changing rural economic patterns, perceptions of tourism as a clean industry, its apparent relative ease of creating jobs and local income, its relatively low capital requirements for business, and other community development benefits (Frederick 1993). These often conflicting factors point to a need for new perspectives in tourism planning.

Indeed, tourism is currently a popular development strategy in rural areas (Cole 1994; Dan and Blevins 1994; Edgell and Edwards 1993; Edgell and Cartwright 1990; Kieselbach and Long 1990). The growth of tourism as a rural development strategy, however, is a relatively new phenomenon. Local policymakers in rural communities realize the importance of this sector but have little or no experience in its development. Numerous authors have provided examples of how unfettered tourism growth can lead to detrimental impacts on sociocultural values of local residents (Milman and Pizam 1988; Jordan 1980; de Kadt 1976), economic diversity/development (Becker and Bradbury 1994; Fik et al. 1993; Fritz 1982; Britton 1977), and the environment (Ryan 1991; Romeril 1989).

In this article, I argue that these negative effects of tourism development result from a general lack of coordination between regional development planning and tourism site planning with respect to economic, environmental, and/or sociocultural impacts. Rarely does one question the compatibility of tourism with broader regional development goals and objectives. It is not readily apparent why this occurs, but part of the cause could be the complexity of the impacts of tourism and the ease with which they elude early identification (Runyan and Wu 1979). Furthermore, there is a tendency to approach tourism with the preconceived opinion that it is tourism that will provide an economic panacea for development of rural regions. A more cautious approach to tourism development, however, one
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that uses more integrative planning processes, has the opportunity to maximize the benefits of tourism while acting to ameliorate the negative impacts. These arguments are not new. Rural tourism planning that is integrative and takes a long-term, community-based approach has been discussed as critical to achieving general community objectives (Fletcher and Cooper 1996; Gibson 1993; Johnson and Thomas 1993; Murphy 1988, 1985, 1983) and is clearly becoming an important role of rural planning professionals in modern society.

Planning academics, particularly in the United States, have tended to ignore tourism research. This trend is beginning to change. The approach of this article is to highlight tourism development and planning in the United States. In particular, the primary focus is on tourism in the rural United States. Much of the previous work in a more integrative approach to tourism planning has taken place in rapidly developing countries or Canada and Western Europe. Some would argue that planning academics and practitioners in the United States have chosen not to show the same attention to tourism, resulting in a weaker understanding and a concomitant lack of attention in rural planning practice. Thus the rural United States suffers from a general lack of effective planning strategies to deal with tourism development and its various impacts.

This article presents a comprehensive literature review focusing on tourism development planning as carried out in rural areas of more developed economies. It attempts to answer some basic questions that, in sum, lead to a more integrative perspective of tourism development. What is known about tourism and its development with respect to locally felt effects in rural regions? Who are the key stakeholders involved in rural tourism development, and why do they approach tourism the way they do? What are the key elements of a more integrative approach to rural tourism planning? What issues are currently being overlooked, and why are these issues important to include in planning frameworks to successfully integrate rural tourism within the broader context of regional development? These are the questions that this review attempts to answer.

This article complements the excellent review of tourism planning in less developed countries presented by Ioannides (1995) in an earlier volume of this journal. Specifically, this review differs from Ioannides’s both in geographic scope and substantive focus. It takes a historical perspective of how our understanding of rural tourism development and its planning have progressed through time and develops the specific issues facing tourism planning today. In particular, I have paid close attention to the literature that addresses integration of tourism with overall regional development issues of rural areas. As such, the review picks up and reinforces the issues brought forth by Inskoep (1988) and Getz (1986) in their notebook articles on the emerging specialization of tourism planning. The purpose of this article is to develop a better understanding of rural tourism planning practice and to apply this understanding into an integrative framework for improving the manner in which we plan for rural tourism development in the United States.

OUR ACADEMIC UNDERSTANDING OF TOURISM

Since World War II, there have been dramatic increases in the institutionalization of educational and research efforts in tourism development. This is, most probably, related to tourism’s rise in popularity as an economic development strategy throughout the world. Today, tourism, recreation, and leisure have a common research and teaching interest in many basic fields of inquiry including geography, economics, psychology, and sociology. Excellent summaries on the contributions of economics to tourism have been done by Eadington and Redman (1991) and Gray (1982). Sociology and tourism has been summarized by Cohen (1979). Travel and tourism as an important line of study in geography has been summarized by Britton (1991). Tourism has also been a common interest in more applied disciplines such as forestry, business, political science, and community development. Tourism, recreation, and leisure as separate academic disciplines have more limited histories.

Historically, tourism research as a distinct line of academic inquiry has been characterized as “relatively brief and disjointed” (Van Doren et al. 1994, 308). The first scientific journal that focused primarily on tourism was The Tourist Review, initiated in 1946. There was little additional cohesive presentation of tourism research until the 1970s (Van Doren et al. 1994) when journals such as The Annals of Tourism Research, the Journal of Travel Research, and Tourism Management were first published. Recently, The Journal of Sustainable Tourism has emerged, emphasizing a broader-based tourism planning perspective. Much of the current work that reports on the forefront of tourism research is done by academics within the more basic disciplines. This statement has roots in work reported by Van Doren and his associates (1994). They analyzed almost 20,000 citations to make conclusions regarding the origin of those conducting research in tourism. Results of this study suggested that those from recreation and tourism disciplines contribute to about 10 percent of the citations found. Most citations have origins within more basic disciplines of sociology, economics, geography, psychology, anthropology, and history.

There is a general need to improve the planner’s understanding of this growing body of literature. Much of the conceptual theory and empirical methodology required for a more integrated rural tourism planning
approach is not new to the academic community. A renewed focus by planning academics to incorporate the understanding of complex tourism effects through formal courses and outreach education provides an important step forward in attaining this integrated approach. This interface between more rigorous assessments and the practice of tourism development provides an environment in which integrative tourism planning can take place.

The planning literature has identified unique processes and methods that are specific to tourism planning (Chon and Evans 1989; Haywood 1988; Baud-Bovy 1982). Tourism development planning in rural areas has developed a growing body of academic literature (Marcouiller 1995; Heise 1994; Gibson 1993; Frederick 1992). Key unique attributes of more integrative tourism planning approaches include incorporating a broad mix of contemporary issues, initiatives, stakeholders, and objectively based data into the regional planning process. What appears lacking in current rural tourism planning practice in the United States are broader regional contexts and appropriate analytical tools.

THE STATUS OF RURAL TOURISM PLANNING IN THE UNITED STATES

There is little doubt that political benefits will continue to place importance on tourism development at the community level. This puts more integrative approaches to tourism planning in an important spotlight. Much of the planning applied to tourism in rural areas of the United States focuses on marketing, promotion, and regional boosterism to attract visitors to rural areas and the businesses that cater to these visitors when they decide to come. This is the basic thrust behind many widely accepted tourism planning texts that emphasize tourism demand planning (Gunn 1994; Morrison 1989) or the business of tourism and commercial recreation (Weston 1996).

Too often, local leaders, with the assistance of state tourism agencies, march forward with strategies to attract visitors to rural regions with little concern and/or effort placed on the impacts these visitors will create. Take, for instance, the efforts in tourism planning offered by state agencies of tourism development around the country. Of the roughly 400 million dollars spent annually by state tourism agencies in the United States, over three-quarters goes directly into marketing, promotion, and visitor assistance (U.S. Travel Data Center 1995). A breakdown in state tourism agency budgets is summarized in Table 1. These state agencies do very little research to assess the effectiveness of tourism in attaining development objectives. Indeed, less than 2 percent of state tourism agency budgets are spent on research. Also, much of what is researched by these agencies deals with the effectiveness of their own marketing initiatives. It is safe to characterize state tourism agencies in the United States as being promotional in their focus.

These state tourism agencies, however, are precisely the institutions best equipped and mobilized to effectively integrate tourism development planning within broader regional development contexts because they are often (a) directly tied to state economic development agencies, (b) staffed by tourism development professionals, (c) relatively well funded, and (d) set up to affect the type and extent of rural tourism development. It is ironic, however, that very few resources of these agencies are being placed in community assistance for rural tourism development. Many of the states have programs to work with local Mainstreet associations, chambers of commerce, and individual tourism development groups. Often, however, these programs are carried out within a marketing framework with the intent to create niche markets and attract more visitors. In fairness, there are noteworthy exceptions that are effective in working with small rural communities to assess tourism within a broader development context. Examples of these include the State of Maine’s program in community assistance (Maine Department of Economic and Community Development 1994), Texas’ community tourism development initiative (Texas Department of Commerce 1993), and Wisconsin’s tourism consultancy program (Wisconsin Department of Development 1992). However, even these examples suffer from insufficient funding relative to other more promotionally focused programs.

Most states also offer technical assistance in tourism development planning to communities in rural areas through educational programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. Although broader in scope to include small business feasibility and applied research on visitor profiles, these programs often lack an integrative tourism planning approach. Examples include the rural tourism development initiatives undertaken by the Minnesota Extension Service’s Tourism Center (Minnesota Extension Service 1991) or the widely proclaimed program known as “Tourism USA” (Weaver 1986). These programs primarily focus on ways communities can improve their ability to attract visitors but have little emphasis on determining whether tourism, as an economic development strategy, fits within regional development goals and objectives. One notable exception includes a project developed in conjunction with the Western Rural Development Center by a team led by Dave Sharpe. The focus of this community tourism assessment project (Western Rural Development Center [WRDC] 1994) is to integrate tourism into rural development planning (although specific procedures applied in this program are not discussed here, the fundamental components are similar to those in the following sec-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Budget (Million $)</th>
<th>Marketing Budget (Million $)</th>
<th>Research Budget (Million $)</th>
<th>Staff Prof./Support (All Positions)</th>
<th>Rural Development and/or Promotion</th>
<th>Employment Issues</th>
<th>Regional Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>12/49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>7/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>14/6</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>18/52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>22/92</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>19/94</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>45/65</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>10/49</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>10/5</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>6/18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>23/50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>17/88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>17/70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>16/12</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>14/13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>40/78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>19/56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>19/18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13/10</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4/54</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>17/19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>8/7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>11/6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>11/24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6/27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>18/54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>7/20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15/81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>13/54</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>15/146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>42/96</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7/60</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>21/66</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>9/6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>33/12</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>14/51</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>a/s</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>a/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>372.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>273.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>646/1759</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>ni</strong></td>
<td><strong>l</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average per state</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1. Continued

NOTE: na = not available.
1. 1993-94 actual fiscal year budgets.
b. Includes media purchases, printing/production, inquiry fulfillment, domestic sales promotion, press/public relations, international advertising, matching funds, direct promotional grants, welcome centers, film offices, and other miscellaneous costs.
c. Includes research monies spent on economic impact, advertising effectiveness, consumer attitude/image/awareness, and visitor profiles.
d. Includes both full- and part-time positions. Prof. includes professional and managerial staff; support includes clerical, sales, interns/students, and other support staff.
e. 1 = takes the lead, a/s = advisory/supporting role, ni = not involved.

The materials used in this project present a leap forward in developing a more integrative tourism planning approach for communities in rural areas. In fact, those writing about this initiative duly note that communities involved in this program are encouraged to look at tourism development in relation to how tourism fits within broader regional development goals. Brass (1994), in discussing how this particular planning approach has been applied in rural communities of the western United States, comments:

[The project] not only helps rural communities determine their area's actual tourism potential, but also requires an estimate of the costs (social, economic and environmental) as well as the benefits of tourism development. . . . "No" is sometimes the best answer to tourism as a development strategy. (p. 12)

A focus on marketing and promotion as the primary activity of tourism planning is overly myopic. Tourism development planning needs to take a more comprehensive approach that incorporates salient issues, stakeholders, and unbiased information on regional impacts. The intent of integrative tourism planning is to provide for tourism development strategies that are effective in enhancing the social, economic, environmental, and political assets in regions and that simultaneously act to minimize the potential liabilities. This has not gone unnoticed in the literature on tourism planning. For instance, texts by Inskeep (1991) and Murphy (1985) and a wide assortment of literature call for more integrative approaches that attempt to place tourism within a broader regional context.

THE INTEGRATIVE TOURISM PLANNING CONTEXT

The literature on tourism planning has shifted from nonintegrated approaches during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s (Gravel 1979; Gunn 1965) to more integrated approaches during the 1980s to the present (Getz and Jamal 1994; Murphy 1988). Nonintegrated approaches typically focused on specific projects or programs without accounting for broader implications, linkages, and trade-offs. Examples of nonintegrated planning approaches include strategic marketing initiatives, destination zone tourism demand planning, and site facility planning, viewed as separate from their respective regional contexts. Nonintegrated approaches have been characterized as limiting by Chow (1980), who focused on the need to integrate tourism with rural development in Hawaii, and Gravel (1979), who looked at the transition to more integrated approaches to tourism planning in Canada during the late 1970s and early 1980s.

More integrated approaches explicitly incorporate the regional economic, social, political, and environmental contexts within which tourism operates. The move from nonintegrated to more integrative approaches entails concepts such as complementarity (the recognition of external ramifications associated with tourism), calibration (an ongoing incorporation of new ideas and concepts based on responses to surveys and analysis), and general system analysis (Gravel 1979). Examples of integrative tourism planning can be found in the previously discussed initiatives of the Western Rural Development Center (Brass 1994; WRDC 1994), the systems approach for rural recreation development described by Long and colleagues (1988), and visitor management planning in the United Kingdom reported by Human (1994).

A key element and difficulty associated with more integrative approaches is the manner in which goals are determined. Historically, nonintegrated tourism planning goals have been dominated by business development and economic growth concerns. Inevitably, the market-oriented system will continue to place business development and economic growth as significant issues around which tourism development goals will be defined. Murphy (1985) states:

In the laissez-faire atmosphere of western societies and a tourism industry dominated by small businesses, economic considerations have been slow in relinquishing priority to other concerns. (p. 157)

Murphy also argues, however, that goals are rapidly shifting to consumer satisfaction, resource protection, sociocultural compatibility, and public affordability of
infrastructure development for tourism. Goals provide important frames of reference in leading development that is appropriate and acceptable to a wider set of stakeholders—or publics. In seeking what is appropriate and acceptable, integrative tourism planning is necessarily concerned with being inclusive and collaborative with those who are affected by development. In forming tourism planning goals, this process of collaboration and inclusion attempts to incorporate both current and future concerns of those who all too often vitiate the planning effort.

Stakeholders

Getz and Jamal (1994) describe integrative tourism planning as a function of the interplay between involved stakeholders. In most tourism situations, these interdependent stakeholders include both the public and private sector, the community as a whole, and the natural resource base that supports tourism. The concept of collaborative planning has been shown to be an alternative to more adversarial group interaction. In an exploratory case study of a regional tourism development planning process undertaken in Alberta, Canada, Getz and Jamal found that although the key components of successful tourism development relied on the financial viability of the project, they also were directly affected by public opinion and the relative strength and power of a broad set of stakeholders.

To use a cliché, the impacts and beauty of tourism development are in the eyes of the beholder. There is a considerable and growing body of literature that attempts to identify differential perceptions of rural tourism as viewed by different stakeholder groups (Madrigal 1995; Martin 1995; Lankford 1994; Lindberg et al. 1994; McCoil and Martin 1994; Allen et al. 1993; Prentice 1993; Caneday and Zeiger 1991; AP 1992, 1990; Allen et al. 1988; Ladewig and McCann 1980; Goudy 1977). Important differences exist in how tourism is viewed among tourists, residents, and tourism-sensitive business owners. Tourists tend to choose destinations based on physical appearance, human sociocultural comfort, and affordability in the short term. Residents of destination areas experience a direct impact from tourists through crowding, localized price inflation, sociocultural cross-filtration, and economic opportunity. Tourism businesses tend to view development with an overriding interest in the resulting demand for the goods and services tourism creates.

These different attitudes transcend direct tourism impacts to underlying issues of regional economic growth and land use. Studying a rural Wisconsin tourism region, Green and colleagues (1996) found that local residents were much less supportive of land-use planning when compared to recreational homeowners. Furthermore, their data suggest that the longer these two groups reside in the area, the more divergent their views on land use and zoning become. These results are consistent with those of Jordan (1980) and underscore the importance of viewing tourism and recreational developments from the perspective of relevant stakeholder groups.

Within these stakeholder categories, income and race play an important role in forming attitudes and perceptions of tourism and its impact on quality-of-life measures (Crotts and Holland 1992). Michal Smith (1989), in her work on the impacts of tourism in the southern United States, presents a fascinating account of differential stakeholder perceptions focused on the role of women in tourism development. In the rural south, Smith found that as communities moved toward reliance on tourism as their economic mainstay, significant changes occurred to those in lower income categories. Predominantly filled by women, the jobs offered by tourism development were not sufficient to sustain household needs and acted to subjugate workers in a continuing subservient role. Smith concludes:

In tourism economies, [state tourism agency promotional activities] have helped boost the success of development that is having a disproportionately negative impact on women, and, as a direct result, their children ... as development becomes more established, the mainstay of tourism economies becomes low-wage, female-dominated, marginal jobs on a road to nowhere. Waitresses, hotel maids, and retail clerks are the undervalued, underpaid backbone of an industry that appears to take far more than it gives to indigenous peoples. In addition to creating virtually inescapable job ghettos for women, a successful tourist attraction more often than not places serious stress on local infrastructure while it degrades the environmental and local culture, gradually diminishing the power of the attraction that first lured visitors to the community. (p. 29)

It is important to consider how involved different stakeholder groups are in the planning process. The very real possibility of excluding certain stakeholder groups can easily derail implementation of comprehensive tourism plans. Strategies that respond to the impacts of tourism on stakeholder groups include embrace, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal (AP and Crompton 1993). More integrative approaches to tourism planning are collaborative and incorporate careful assessment of local and regional impacts.

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING

It can prove beneficial to use the constructs of collaboration theory in community-based destination planning to develop a sense of community involvement. Specific stages in collaboration theory include problem setting, direction setting, and implementation.
Jamal and Getz (1995) have studied the issues and applications specific to collaboration in tourism planning and offer a good set of propositions to guide planners in facilitating community tourism collaboration. These include (1) recognition of interdependencies, (2) recognition of benefits, (3) perception that decisions will be implemented, (4) incorporation of key stakeholders, and (5) specific suggestions for the role of a convener and the flow of the general process. Collaboration theory provides one process technique within which integrative tourism planning efforts can be carried out.

The development of integrative tourism planning rests upon the assumption of an ability to assess consequences of tourism planning initiatives (issues of impact assessment are more fully described in a later section). A broad category of “futures research” addresses the linkages between tourism planning, tourism policy, and forecasting (van Doorn 1982). Futures research is concerned with forecasting and is outlined to encompass four basic categories: explorative, speculative, normative, and integrative (van Doorn 1982). Combining forecasting with tourism and recreation policy-making is an important continuing need (Johnson and Thomas 1993). To make matters more complex, many effects associated with tourism development are subjective in their very nature and difficult to quantify. This is particularly true for quality-of-life measures in rural communities that are so often used as a basis for rural tourism policy arguments (Christensen 1995). Although filled with analytical and empirical difficulty, these cause-effect relationships of rural tourism development are a fundamental underlying requirement in most integrative tourism planning frameworks.

**Framework for Integrative Tourism Planning**

Baud-Bovy and Lawson (1977) outline a flexible monitoring and feedback system of tourism planning. This system was used with tourism developers in Europe during the 1970s and early 1980s as they moved to more integrative approaches to tourism planning. The salience of this approach to tourism planning can easily be extended to both public and private development planning anywhere. The tourism planning method that Baud-Bovy and Lawson advocate is called the products analysis sequence for outdoor leisure planning (PASOLP). In this approach, interdependencies between the tourism sector and regional social, economic, environmental, cultural, and political resources are explicitly identified with respect to geographic linkages and industry resources. The PASOLP method begins with a “flow by flow elaboration and analysis of alternate tourism products” (Baud-Bovy and Lawson 1977, 312). These alternate products are assessed for (1) natural, cultural, and human resources important to tourism; (2) tourism market needs; (3) specific regional political and economic context; and (4) competition from substitute and complementary destinations.

A diagrammatic representation of the PASOLP approach is found in Figure 1. Alternate tourism products are analyzed for feasibility from a cost-benefit perspective. These are reviewed with reference to the region’s development objectives to identify priority tourism products. Selected tourism products are then the subject of physical master planning from facility development, plan implementation, and impact assessment (economic, social, environmental). Concerning participant input into the process, Baud-Bovy and Lawson (1977) state:

This approach calls for the opinion of all parties liable to be affected by or to benefit from tourism development, combining their common interests and settling their eventual divergences. (p. 313)

The PASOLP approach to tourism planning relies on a continuous feedback loop that monitors the tourism system being developed (see Figure 2). This monitoring system allows flexibility to integrate changes in political, cultural, economic, or technological situations into the tourism planning process. An effective monitoring system allows periodic plan revisions, using available data on changing outputs with respect to the goals of the plan. In a later article, Baud-Bovy (1982) laments the fact that many tourism development plans fail in the implementation stage. He argues that the difficulties associated with implementing tourism plans are primarily the result of a lack of breadth in issue development. Thus these difficulties can be alleviated through a more comprehensive assessment of socioeconomic, political, cultural, and environmental implications of tourism development in the tourism planning process.

The PASOLP method provides a comprehensive beginning to the development of a more integrative approach to tourism planning. It is not, however, without its critics. Murphy (1985) criticizes the PASOLP approach to tourism planning as too top-down in its orientation, with little explicit ability to include general citizen participation. This is important because of the specific differential impacts of tourism development experienced by residents and the inherent ability of local citizens to derail the implementation process. Furthermore, the method does not detail specific issues related to economic and social impact used in selecting priority tourism products.

**Regional Scale and Integrative Rural Tourism Planning**

A convenient categorization scheme to organize the discussion of tourism planning and policy development
context is regional scale. These different scales can be associated with unique planning elements and processes appropriate to integrative rural tourism planning. The following discussion outlines the various spatial contexts within which rural tourism planning processes and public policies are formed.

**REGIONAL, STATE, AND MULTISTATE CONTEXT**

Planning for tourism on a regional scale is important in both public and private decision making to identify zones of tourism opportunities, formulate region-specific policies, and develop guidelines that promote integration of tourism within broader regional goals and objec-
tives. Examples of regional tourism planning scales include national, state (province), or substate regions. Regions can be viewed as encompassing administrative/political, environmental (natural resource-based), sociocultural/built environment, or industrial makeup. There are ties that bind larger regions together from a tourism perspective, and a considerable body of literature focuses on what constitutes tourism-specific

gions (Leatherman and Marcouiller 1997; Lystad 1991; Lovingwood and Mitchell 1989; S. Smith 1988). Much of what ties a tourism region together relates to demand, marketing, and site development. Furthermore, locally based economic policies of rural regions and the manner in which tourism contributes are, in large part, reflective of these unique regional characteristics. Research that characterizes sociocultural, economic, environmental,
or political impacts of tourism often uses these alternative regional specifications as the basis for conclusions and suggestions for appropriate policies.

Operationally, an important aspect of regional tourism planning deals with matching markets (demand) with appropriate rural tourism development. The manner in which attractions, infrastructure, accommodations, and supporting facilities combine to develop tourism experiences differ dramatically in a spatial sense and define unique regional characteristics. Much has been written about this demand-supply match with regard to designing tourism regions (Gunn 1994, 1965; Murphy and Andressen 1988; V. L. Smith et al. 1986). The evaluation of tourism opportunities requires this assessment of regional attributes, particularly those appropriate for aiding the development of national, state, and substate regional marketing/promotion plans and their appropriate segmentation (Davis et al. 1993). Indeed, much emphasis in regional tourism planning deals with efforts to attract tourists and promote tourism. Marketing is often more efficiently accomplished from a regional basis (Roehl et al. 1989; V. L. Smith et al. 1986).

An assessment of natural, built-environment, and cultural resources—often called a tourism inventory—is important to regional tourism planning (Gunn 1994, 1965; Inskoep 1991). The process of identification of resources, mapping spatial characteristics, and development of a framework for integrating tourism demand into a regional tourism concept are often found embedded within the tourism product identification phase of integrative rural tourism planning for regions (Fletcher and Cooper 1996; Oppermann 1996; WRDC 1996). This leads to recommendations for tourism policy and programs that target the physical development of regions for capturing tourism potential.

Integrative rural tourism planning, however, goes beyond this focus on regional marketing and promotion. Operationally, the integration of stakeholders, public tourism agencies, outdoor recreation providers, and tourism businesses with respect to goals and outcomes is a generally neglected aspect of regional tourism planning in rural areas of the United States and elsewhere (Lankford 1994; Krippendorf 1982). It may simply be the case that regional marketing and promotion is the path of least resistance for rural tourism planning when faced with overlapping administrative boundaries, competitive economic development concerns, and partisan political environments. More integrative approaches assess identified priority tourism products with regard to the regional context of social, economic, cultural, and political resources to develop an integrated regional tourism plan. This integration includes important issues of environmental conserva-

tion, economic development, and sociocultural preservation (Inskoep 1991; Murphy 1985).

TOURISM PLANNING FOR COMMUNITIES

Actual physical development of tourism infrastructure, facilities, and destinations rarely occurs in a regional planning context. These have been relegated primarily to a community planning context, often with direction and recommendations taken from regional tourism plans. The community concept of tourism planning is often called destination planning. Gunn (1994) developed the concept of a destination zone that recognized the role of planning for community-based tourism. He argued that it was the community that provided both the necessary tourism infrastructure and most tourism attractions. The community, from Gunn’s perspective, was not limited to the administrative boundaries of municipalities but extended into rural areas surrounding these units. The surrounding area provided significant natural resources that were linked to community tourism services and were thus essential to the rural tourism planning process.

More often than not, destination planning has been overly concerned with economic criteria, primarily the financial success of local businesses. There is a growing concern that tourism destination planning should take a more integrative approach that is tied to resident perceptions and citizen participation in the planning process. Much has been written about the ability of communities to strive for and develop consensus in tourism development (Chon and Evans 1989; Murphy 1988). Integrative rural tourism planning that is sensitive to rural residents’ preferences and priorities enables better linkages to be made between urban and rural areas (Murphy and Andressen 1988). This sensitivity to local concerns seeks to include local citizen participation for a more comprehensive identification of both positive and negative social, environmental, and economic implications of tourism development (Allen et al. 1988; Haywood 1988; Millman and Fizam 1988).

It is also argued that tourism planning at the community level should begin to extend beyond physical planning to deal with facility management for visitors. Discussion of an integrative approach to community tourism planning from a visitor management perspective has been proposed by Huma (1994) from work carried out in the United Kingdom. In this visitor management planning framework, decisions to develop community facilities are based on a broader set of spatial goals and policy objectives from regional and national levels. The relationships between national, regional, and local units of government are a function of effective policy input, monitoring/review, cooperation/consultation, involvement of elected members, and information (data) for monitoring/evaluation. Human
argues that communities are active participants in developing tourism destination sites and need to be concerned about visitor management.

SITE CONTEXT FOR TOURISM PLANNING

The physical development of tourism attractions, facilities, and services is conducted at sites within destination zones. The site context for tourism planning is generally the result of public, private, or combined public-private investments and development. It is typically where the final use of guidance provided by regional and destination planning efforts occurs. Specific processes undertaken in tourism site planning are similar to general site planning and appear to rely heavily on project-level cost-benefit analysis. Site planning progresses from market analysis to program statement, site selection and revision in program, site analysis, synthesis, conceptual design, feasibility, final plan, and evaluation. Much of the necessary discussion to understand site context for tourism planning is beyond the scope of this article and focuses on site design concepts. Readers interested in site design with specific reference to tourism development are referred to works by Warren (1991), Motloch (1991), and Marshall (1983). It is necessary, however, to outline briefly the unique actors involved in site planning, the issues characteristic of site planning, and the integration of site planning with other planning contexts and with exogenous factors in proximity to the tourism development site.

Responsibility for planning at the site level remains with design professionals drawing on backgrounds in engineering, architecture, landscape architecture, and interior design. Site planning focuses on technical aspects of site design such as drainage, horticulture, and structural components. Other groups involved both directly and indirectly at the implementation stage of tourism planning include private developers, financial interests, construction professionals, managers, and various publics (Gunn 1994). The publics are an interested party to tourism site planning and can have dramatic influence on the outcome of site planning. They include advocacy groups with special interests in cultural and historic preservation, environmental protection, management, and conservation. Also found within these publics are trade associations, tour organizers, and others interested in the outcome of site planning.

The issues pertinent to site planning often surround the maintenance or development of a sense of place. Society often assigns importance to tourism site design for reasons of place preservation and development. This probably results from the meanings society holds (or perceives) for land, culture, and preservation of society in general. Landscapes and places have been perceived to hold importance because of their role in providing nature, habitat, artifact, system, problem, wealth, ideology, history, place, and aesthetic values (Gunn 1994; Motloch 1991). The actual design of tourism sites is often intertwined with these values.

In concluding this section, it is important to realize that the site context of tourism planning is where regional and destination contexts yield tangible results. Seminal work by Clawson and Knetoch (1966) outlines the “recreation experience” concept, focusing attention on the need to integrate the various regional contexts for effective recreation planning. These authors argue that the on-site portion of the experience is the immediate localized component of the total experience that is spatially and temporally broader. Fridgen (1984) modified the Clawson and Knetoch concept to the psychology of tourism demand and argued for better integration of the overall tourism experience that includes region, community, and site. The integration of site planning with destination and regional planning is important to general planning effectiveness. This brings to the forefront the cooperative nature of more integrative approaches to rural tourism planning—that of both public and private decisionmakers with the citizens at all spatial levels, namely, region, community, and site. Without this interplay, effectiveness within any individual context lacks meaning and provides moot outcomes.

FOSTERING INTEGRATIVE PLANNING USING AN EXPANDED SET OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Our ability to develop more integrative approaches to tourism planning in rural areas rests on an ability to work with local stakeholder groups to better understand changes occurring in rural regions. This requires a refocused effort to incorporate important issues specific to the way rural economies work as well as issues that are the inevitable consequences of tourism development in rural regions. Often the direct result of rural collaborative partnerships, the identification of a broader set of issues allows planners to address the important environmental, social, and economic issues that, when left alone, often derail tourism development initiatives. Without explicitly dealing with these issues in more integrative tourism planning frameworks, there is a natural tendency for market forces to create situations in which specific social, political, and economic consequences will occur. These consequences may or may not be in the best interest of rural communities. Some of the more substantive issues pertinent to rural tourism planning are categorized below from their respective disciplines; these include rural economic development and rural sociological and environmental issues.

Economic Development
Issues of Tourism in Rural Areas

Economic development in rural areas has undergone fundamental change over the past two decades. In
many rural regions, the regional economic base has historically centered on agricultural production and processing or traditional forest-dependent industries such as sawmills and papermaking. General agricultural decline, in relative terms, and an increasing concern over single-industry dependence in regional economies have identified the limitations of these more traditional sources of rural economic growth. The fundamental changes that these rural economies are facing have raised numerous economic development policy questions.

**INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND EQUITY CONCERNS**

One such policy question centers on the perceived trade-offs between traditional sources of rural economic growth and tourism. Concerns have been voiced over the nature of tourism-based jobs and the impact on income distributions that certain development policies might foster. Local residents often reject suggestions to embrace alternate economic uses of their resource base, such as tourism. Arguments are made that tourism jobs are inferior to more traditional jobs. Furthermore, some point out that employment in tourism leads to the general exploitation of the poor by the rich (Ashworth 1992; M. Smith 1989). Although alternative economic development strategies for rural regions are known to have important effects on the distribution of income (Leatherman and Marcouiller 1996; Marcouiller et al. 1995; Boyd and Hyde 1989), and methods for estimating those effects are available (Rose et al. 1989, 1988; Pyatt and Round 1985), few studies have examined the effect of alternative strategies such as tourism development on income distribution.

There are two basic areas in which income distribution and differential effects by income groups are important for integrative tourism development planning in rural regions. One deals specifically with tourism business development and its use of factor inputs (land, labor, and capital). Differences in the use of factor inputs by economic sector lead to different effects by income group. This can be referred to as the supply-side or income-related distributitional effect. Leatherman (1995) and Leatherman and Marcouiller (1996) examined tourism in a rural region of southwestern Wisconsin as one of five alternative strategies for regional economic development. In these studies, tourism as a development strategy created a hollowing out of the effects on middle-income households, with primary effects being felt within high-income and low-income households, thus supporting the arguments of Ashworth (1992) and M. Smith (1989). This contrasts with traditional agricultural and forestry development alternatives that create more evenly distributed effects on income.

The other important category of the distributional effect of tourism in rural regions relates to demand and the public sector planning required to develop tourism resources. This can be referred to as the demand-side distributional effect, and is based on the idea that demand for tourism differs by income category. Eadington and Redman (1991), Dardis and colleagues (1994), and Crouch (1994) discuss what is known about the linkage between household income and leisure expenditures. Most studies have found that travel expenditures are income elastic; that is, expenditures are sensitive to changes in income. Public efforts to develop certain tourism destinations, for example, through government-sponsored promotional campaigns, can create inequities and lead to demand-side benefits (use) that primarily draw upper income groups. On the other hand, funding of publicly provided recreational facilities benefits lower and middle-income households.

Equity in benefits and costs is indeed important when planning for rural tourism development. It is, however, rarely assessed in tourism planning practice. Although certain planning arenas account for and target effects to specific income groups implicitly (such as housing policy and social services), current rural tourism development planning, as tracked in the tourism literature, is generally satisfied with aggregate analysis that identifies gross benefits of industry growth on regional economic structures (Johnson and Moore 1993; Fletcher 1989; Kotke 1988). Recently, there has been growing interest in the tourism planning literature for research that accounts for differential effects of alternative policies (Kamma and Salehi-Esfahani 1992) and addresses the continuing need to more accurately assess who benefits from various alternatives (Eadington and Redman 1991; Thraen et al. 1989; V. K. Smith 1987; Stoll et al. 1987). Although early distributional (or class) arguments have been made for differentiating tourism effects by income category (Britton 1982; de Kadt 1979; Farrell 1979), their integration into the basic tourism planning literature is lacking (see e.g., Gunn 1994; Inskoop 1991). Furthermore, disaggregating tourism effects based on other demographic characteristics such as race and gender (M. Smith 1989) would probably explain many important perceptions of tourism by stakeholders. The assessment of the distribution of income and jobs generated by tourism development and actions taken to ameliorate negative results are fundamental to sustainable community development using tourism.

**ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENTS**

Analytically, economic impact assessment of tourism has ranged from detailed input-output models (Fleming and Toepfer 1991; Bergstrom et al. 1990; Fletcher 1989) for deriving multiplier effects to the use of linear programming models to identify the optimal number of tourism firms in a region (Kotke 1988). The core issues involved in economic impact assessment are the manner in which income is created and how this
income flows through the local economy. As previously discussed, traditional economic impact assessment has been overly concerned with aggregate measures of income generated, totally overlooking distributional effects on specific income and social groups. An integrative approach to rural tourism planning requires the analysis to address these distributional effects.

Locally, the economic impacts of rural tourism often focus on specific tourism-related activities. Too often this is done to provide local tourism boosters with an estimate of economic benefits without a careful assessment of costs. Getz (1991) critiques methods used in economic impact assessment of festivals and events and argues that a full view of costs and benefits needs to be taken. Looking at the costs of tourism activities provides a slanted perspective that places incomplete information in front of community decisionmakers. Rural planners are responsible for developing unbiased assessments of economic development alternatives. Better estimates of direct costs to the host community and correct specifications of leakages (interregional trade flows) of income accruing to businesses involved in tourism (particularly with franchises and other businesses whose owners reside outside the local region) could improve the assessment of economic impacts (Johnson et al. 1989).

**JOBS IN TOURISM**

A key element in community support of tourism development is the ability to create jobs. Many argue that policymakers base decisions on tourism development from a job creation standpoint without sufficient information on the actual employment performance of tourism industries (Hudson and Townsend 1993). Analysis of tourism employment needs to account for more than simply numbers of jobs. The types of jobs created—from the standpoint of wage rates, permanence, career opportunities, and skill levels—are important. Indeed, many have noted that jobs in tourism tend to be relatively low wage, seasonal, and part-time (Luloff et al. 1994; Blank 1989; Stynes and Pigozzi 1983). The availability of these employment opportunities is often seen as beneficial and appropriate to local labor markets. Assessing the types of jobs created by tourism and matching them with regional employment goals is an important aspect of integrating tourism with the overall mix of regional development strategies.

This need to focus on quantifying tourism employment poses difficulties because there is considerable debate among researchers on the question of just what constitutes employment in tourism. Johnson and Thomas (1990) outline two methods of tracking tourism employment. The first of these is the expenditure method, which identifies ratios used to derive employment figures from expenditure data. This method provides the closest approximation of employment that is directly attributable to tourists because the base data are tourist expenditures. Limitations of this method include the assumptions used to identify ratios and the inability to support an estimate with standard employment data sources. The second employment tracking technique is the employment count method, which identifies employment in tourism-related industries by specific standard industrial classification (SIC) categories and relies on count data from firms. The benefits of this method are that counts agree with standard reporting sources and that it is possible to identify employment in industries that may be enabling to tourism but not reliant on tourism. Limitations of this method include the inability to separate employment that relies on tourism from employment that enables tourism. This limitation is alleviated by strategic identification of tourism-enabling industries and tourism-reliant industries by SIC code. Brown and Connelly (1986) studied employment in tourism using this method and identified other benefits from using data that are regularly published by stable sources. These benefits include the ability to track tourism employment over time, particularly throughout the seasons.

It is also important to realize that an assessment of labor used in tourism is incomplete without a full assessment of the self-employed component, including both business owners and their families. Secondary sources of data do a poor job of capturing this element. Often, the entrepreneurial opportunity portion of this self-employed element is a primary objective underlying rural tourism development policy. Evidence suggesting this is found in arguments that promote the generation of tourism-related business benefits in local communities. The poorly paid informal labor market consisting of family assistance is rarely brought into focus. Integrative tourism planning could incorporate a more comprehensive and objective assessment of employment in tourism.

**ECONOMIC DIVERSITY AND STABILITY**

Another argument for an integrative approach to tourism planning in rural regions is the need to develop a broad array of employment opportunities. It has been shown that rural regions with broader economic bases experience more stable economic characteristics (Siegel et al. 1995; Berck et al. 1992). Indeed, many have used economic diversity arguments to call for alternative strategies such as tourism for regional development. This is particularly true for rural amenity-rich areas where tourism opportunities are continually being developed. Strong arguments have been made for economic diversity in regional industrial structures, with particular emphasis on rural areas (Overdevest and Green 1995; Berck et al. 1992). Similar to the experience of agriculture and forestry, tourism can tend to dominate rural economies. Certain regions, for example, the
rural portions of the Florida peninsula, have developed a dependency on tourism industries. Pik et al. (1993) show that although large tourism flows provide for economic growth during good times, the effects of slowing tourism transfers cause offsetting structural deficits. Also, from a regional economic development perspective, tourism is not clearly understood with regard to competitiveness and stability with alternative strategies (Krolis 1993). An integrated tourism planning framework would address these issues by allowing rural policymakers to place tourism within a broader set of development strategies.

LOCALIZED PRICE INFLATION AND SEASONALITY

Tourism is a highly seasonal phenomenon (Stynes and Pigozzi 1983; Sutcliffe and Sinclair 1980). Tourists place increased seasonal demands on the supply of local goods and services in rural areas. Within market-oriented economic structures, this places upward pressure on prices for local goods and services. Although this can be viewed as having a positive impact on local entrepreneurs, seasonal price inflation poses very real hardships for local residents who do not sell goods and services. This is particularly important for the availability of affordable housing, where rental rates and purchase prices are affected. Coupled with relatively low wage rates, this affects employees of tourism businesses and low-income residents directly. Other sectors involved with the retailing of personal consumption items are also subject to seasonal price inflation. Seasonal price inflation caused by tourism and travel demand affects grocery and general merchandise retail, restaurants, and recreational activities.

The seasonality of tourism is also important to the general livelihood of residents in regions experiencing tourism development. Business success in rural areas is dependent on the seasonality of demands brought on by tourists. Off-season slow periods create dramatic downturns in cash flow for rural community businesses. Marketing efforts often target the draw of travelers to shoulder seasons, or early/late months, to reduce these seasonal demands. To be sure, some communities and regions have enjoyed limited success in expanding the tourist season (Bradbury and Becker 1994). Notwithstanding, most tourism businesses experience at least one-quarter of the year when demand dwindles.

PUBLICLY PROVIDED GOODS AND SERVICES

Tourism places demands on local goods and services, particularly infrastructure and public services. Heavy seasonal tourism demands for roads, water, police, and fire protection create very real costs to local units of government in rural communities. These public services are often difficult to provide because of the limits of generating revenue from local year-round resident populations. Seasonal demands on local public goods and services provide justification for revenue-generating mechanisms that shift incidence of tax receipts to travelers (such as the room tax). Often, local debate is polarized between those who advocate general revenue fund use of tourism taxes versus those who want to earmark these funds to further tourism promotional uses. Specific issues related to the tax base expansion, taxation incidence, and the burden of local governments that result from highly seasonal tourism demands require thorough examination (Hultkrantz 1994; Mak and Sakai 1994; Hiemstra and Ismail 1993; Teisl and Reiling 1990; Weston 1983; Fritz 1982). This applies particularly to tourism-related sales taxes and property taxes paid by nonresident second homeowners.

Rural Sociological Issues of Tourism Development

Social issues arise as tourism development proceeds in rural communities. The sociology of tourism is difficult to generalize and has not lent itself to the development of universal, unilinear social models. Some argue that development of a common research style for addressing the sociology of tourism can build upon the approach of multiplicity of types, widely varying topologies, and a multilinear approach to the dynamics of tourism (Cohen 1979). The “host and guest relationship” is an accepted expression for the dichotomous social perspectives of community residents of a tourism area and the tourists visiting the area (Inskeep 1991; V. L. Smith 1989). Primary differences exist between these two groups with respect to social, political, or class (economic) characteristics. The manner in which these two groups interact can be a critical factor in the success or failure of tourism development. Also, differences exist in basic value and logic systems, religious beliefs, traditions, customs, lifestyles, behavioral patterns, dress codes, sense of time budgeting, attitude toward strangers, and other sociocultural factors that create situations that affect the success or failure of tourism development (Inskeep 1991).

Travelers, by the very nature of being away from their home environments, experience a tourist culture that is often very different than their respective home culture. Tourists often perceive themselves to be “emancipated” from their more familiar sociocultural bounds, resulting in different behavioral patterns (Inskeep 1991; Jafari 1987). While traveling, tourists use different social constraints, feel less inhibited, and often seek experiences that would not be socially accepted in their home culture. The injection of tourists into a rural community often leads to a situation in which a previously homogeneous community becomes diversified, with groups exhibiting different responses to developments (Inskeep 1991). Community responses range from resis-
tance, retreatism, and boundary building to rejection of traditional culture and adoption of the tourists' culture. Other important sociocultural effects of tourism development on rural communities include developing a local sense of place, community pride or image, and local quality of life (Gurn 1994). For instance, many of the objectives behind the development of community festivals and events include these more subjective benefits (Sem and Simonson 1989). Christensen (1995) argues that it is important to incorporate the more subjective nature of these effects in tourism planning frameworks. However, the lack of well-developed measures to assess these effects makes this a difficult task. Tourism provides communities with important social benefits that extend well beyond economic impacts. On the other hand, inappropriate development and overuse can also create situations in which sense of place and community pride are lost. This is particularly true when cultural resources are cast aside in favor of more mainstream tourism development (Inskeep 1991).

Tourism development is also linked to specific social ills that require assessment through integrative planning frameworks. General sociocultural problems that are exacerbated by certain forms of tourism development are discussed in Milman and Pizam (1988), Liu and Var (1986), and Cooke (1982). Specifically, effects that result from cross-fertilization of cultures can dilute local cultures unless specifically addressed in the planning process (Cater 1987; Spanoudis 1982). Also, the effect of tourism development on crime incidence has been important in determining the social effects of tourism (Pizam 1982; Fujii and Mak 1980; McPheters and Strong 1974). In many rural areas of the United States, gaming as a recreational and business activity has increased as casinos run by Native American tribal units of government riverboat gambling interests have become more prevalent (Harris 1994). Although this has helped to create employment opportunities and to generate revenues for specific tribal units and casino management firms, there has been an increasing awareness of gambling addictions and other related social concerns (Caneday and Zeiger 1991). Careful assessment and implementation of policy tools to limit negative impacts on social attributes is an important component of integrative tourism planning in rural settings.

Environmental Issues of Rural Tourism

Various forms of tourism development in rural areas can raise environmental concerns. Many forms of tourism can lead to resource degradation, often of the very resources that originally drew people to rural areas (Cater 1987; Krippendorf 1982). The natural environment is a major draw for visits to regions where natural resources are abundant. Environmental impacts of tourism development are important issues to deal with in integrative planning processes (Green and Hunter 1993; Romeril 1989).

Environmental Impacts and Tourism Planning

Tourism development often has direct adverse effects on the natural environment. The effect of tourism on the natural environment depends on the location, type, and extent of tourism development. Clearly, ski areas in mountain regions, and those that use snowmaking equipment, have the potential for affecting sediment flow of streams. Herbicide and pesticide use on golf courses and other tourist developments present environmental risks (Salvesen 1996). Romeril (1989, 207) argues that tourism businesses that dismiss the need for environmental sensitivity as the "prejudiced view of a minority" are committing a fatal mistake. The economic viability (one measure of sustainability) of tourism in communities depends on integrating economic benefits with environmental needs. Incorporating environmental issues into economic objectives of regional tourism development helps limit adverse impacts. Inskeep (1987) and others reinforce the idea that environmental planning enhances financial returns. Ignoring integrative frameworks that incorporate environmental issues into rural tourism planning creates a risk of unchecked development, which can destroy the very essence of why people are attracted to rural regions.

Compared to extractive forms of natural resource use, tourism development is generally recognized as having relatively little direct environmental impact. This is particularly the case when environmental planning approaches are applied. Many have argued for an environmental planning approach that includes technical assessment of environmental impacts, application of appropriate environmental mitigation techniques, and implementation of sound environmental planning principles (Australian Tourism Industry Association 1990; Inskeep 1987). These plans often call for integrating regional tourism plans with total resource analysis and development. Land-use and site planning for tourism establishments require the application of sound environmental principles including water and energy conservation, erosion control, and solid waste and recycling management.

Environmental Perceptions and Tourism

Perceptions of environmental impacts related to tourism differ among various groups. Kavallinis and Pizam (1994) surveyed residents, entrepreneurs, and tourists on a Greek island for perceptions toward tourism's environmental impacts. The results suggest that tourists perceive residents and entrepreneurs to be more responsible for negative environmental impacts than
themselves. Residents’ perceptions were found to be not significantly different from those of entrepreneurs. This combined group felt that negative environmental impacts of tourism were not as serious as the negative effects perceived by tourists. These varying perceptions substantiate other research that identified residents as more prone to accept tourism development at any cost, while tourists tend to have environmental protection concerns (Dowling 1993). The authors of both studies call for more systematic local and regional tourism planning to ameliorate negative environmental impacts.

Increased use of rural areas for tourism coupled with an increased awareness of visual aesthetics and concerns about biodiversity have led to visitor skepticism toward traditional economic uses of natural resources in rural areas and to compatibility issues of traditional land uses with outdoor recreation and tourism. Tourism-based development of rural regions has limited compatibility with the manner in which these lands are managed for commodity production. Take, for example, the compatibility of outdoor recreational use of forests for hiking and wilderness use with the growing and harvesting of trees for wood products. In many respects, wilderness use of forest land is inimical to harvesting activities. The work of Clawson (1974) has provided insight into these land-use compatibility linkages. In addressing limitations of land-use compatibility, he points to the value of conflict management to deal with problems unique to forested regions. All too often, conflicts generated from forest use incompatibilities are resolved through litigation in a zero-sum fashion with the values of winners (gain) being completely offset by the values associated with losers (loss). Conflict management and collaborative processes, as part of more integrative planning frameworks, can help to create managed outcomes of land-use conflicts that are positive-sum (Marcouiller and Ellefson 1987). Although there are limitations to environmental mediation and other alternative dispute resolution techniques (Campbell and Floyd 1996), these techniques represent an opportunity to incorporate a wide array of stakeholder interests in environmental outcomes and provide a viable alternative to litigation when resolving rural disputes that result from tourism development.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this article is to provide a perspective of rural tourism planning as practiced today, and to apply concepts from the tourism and planning literature to a more integrative approach. The ultimate objective, in practice, is to improve the manner in which planners integrate rural tourism development into broader regional development contexts. The frameworks within which more integrative approaches to rural tourism planning take place incorporate the widely divergent perspectives of tourism held by various stakeholder groups and attempt to deal with the complexity of specific issues facing rural communities today. In this article, I have argued that current tourism development planning in rural areas of the United States is overly concerned with regional boosterism intent on drawing increased numbers of visitors to small communities. This occurs while overlooking what happens within these communities as tourism develops. Rural planners need to question the compatibility of tourism within broader regional development goals and objectives that incorporate the views of a wide array of publics. Tourism development in rural communities presents a complex set of benefits and costs requiring more thorough assessment that goes beyond preconceived notions that tourism somehow provides an economic panacea for development of rural regions. A more cautious approach to tourism development that uses more integrative planning processes has the opportunity to maximize the benefits of tourism while acting to ameliorate the negative effects.

Planning educators, particularly in the United States, are encouraged to further incorporate tourism into rural development coursework to improve the understanding of future rural planning practitioners. The planning profession has a critical and increasingly important role to play in tourism development (Richter 1985). An integrative approach to tourism planning requires planners to approach tourism from a collaborative perspective. It allows planners to address a more comprehensive array of analytical issues and create inclusive processes that account for the widely varying perceptions and differential effects of tourism on rural citizens (Prentice 1993).

Planning academics are also encouraged to further contribute to our understanding of tourism through research that develops appropriate theoretical constructs, empirical methods, and creative planning processes to better integrate tourism within rural economic structures. Important economic planning research in the future can take many forms. There is a general need to develop more concise definitions for the various types of tourism taking place in rural areas (Leiper 1990, 1979; S. Smith 1987). Are aggregate tourism definitions that include all travel, regardless of travel motivation, satisfactory? Are there planning needs that could benefit from distinguishing business travelers from those who travel for pleasure? What activities are included in discussions of tourism in rural areas? As technology transforms rural areas, how will planners deal with increases of in-migrating amenity seekers (Marcouiller et al. 1996; Moss 1994)? How can rural planners more effectively deal with polarized factions as rural areas experience increased disparity between the very rich
and the very poor? Are aggregate measures of economic impact sufficient? How do rural planners address the need to shift incidence of taxation to tourists in an effort to help pay for infrastructure and public services to satisfy increased seasonal demands? These are some of the rural development questions that can be answered through refocused research efforts in economic development planning.

There is a need to evaluate tourism effectiveness within the broader context of community or regional development goals. Given that there exists a set of identifiable community or regional development goals, integrative tourism planning entails a careful assessment of tourism impacts relative to other rural development strategies (Chow 1980). Much of the discussion related to assessment of regional development integration emphasizes the relationship between the type of economic activity and regional development goals for the future (Rodenburg 1980). There is a need to continue developing frameworks within which benefits and costs can be quantified relative to community or regionwide criteria. State tourism agencies are well advised to devote more time, money, and effort to objective impact assessments, integrative regional planning assistance, and program evaluation.

Many effects attributable to tourism are of a nonmarket nature (i.e., not traded in the marketplace). These include the effects of tourism in developing a sense of place and pride; increased awareness and appreciation for environmental, historic, and cultural resources; resource existence values; provision of recreational activities for lower income residents; and political benefits and liabilities for tourism stakeholders. A general need exists to better differentiate economic, social, and environmental impacts into local winners and losers (de Kadt 1979) and to incorporate these differential impacts, particularly those experienced by local residents of rural areas, into the planning process (Getz 1983).

In summary, I agree with others who suggest a broader, more integrative, and strategic approach to tourism planning. There is more to tourism planning than business retention/expansion and regional promotion. The community basis for tourism development allows for integrative plans that are effective in attaining broadly defined goals and objectives of rural communities. Integrated and strategic tourism planning becomes quite important in taking advantage of opportunities in a way that complements rural community assets.

The call for a more integrative tourism planning process has taken root within academic communities. Although the relevance of an academic perspective to day-to-day tourism development is often ambiguous, there are many opportunities to translate this perspec-

tive through educational programming and planning practice. Meeting these educational needs has led to outreach programming that focuses on tourism development and outdoor recreation. Tourism development education is often criticized as lacking rigorous evaluation and monitoring efforts (Luloff et al. 1994), but is commonly directly linked to community outreach programs. In the rural United States, well-developed tourism programming initiatives by the Cooperative Extension Service can be valuable in developing an integrative perspective of tourism within a broader community development framework (Brass 1994; WRDC 1994; Weaver 1993, 1986; Minnesota Extension Service 1991; Gitelson 1989; Norman 1989; Sem 1989).

It is fitting to conclude this article with a statement that summarizes the need for a careful approach to tourism development that is integrated with overall regional goals. It is found in Murphy's (1985) work on tourism development planning and calls those interested in sustaining rural communities to attention:

Economic problems . . . have led many communities to consider embracing this growth industry of the postindustrial era. To do so, however, without careful analysis and consideration of the consequences can lead these same communities into a quicksand of false expectations. (p. 176)

NOTE

1. This can be said of both private and public development initiatives. A notable exception, however, is the development of public outdoor recreation facilities that are often priorities of regional tourism plans. There is a growing awareness of the need to focus public facility development in proximity to demand sources (population centers), hence lending credence to the idea that physical development tends to be a more a destination- or site-specific issue than a regional planning issue.

In writing this review, I have benefited from the critical and collegial mentoring of Steve Born, Michael Wiseman, Jack Huddleston, Harriet Moyer, Ron Shaffer, Bill Norman, and Bill Ryan. Also, I extend thanks to the editors and three anonymous reviewers of the Journal of Planning Literature for critical comments on earlier versions of this manuscript. Of course and as always, errors, omissions, or misinterpretations remain my own.
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