PETER WILTSHIER

HEALTH AND WELFARE AS METAPHORS FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TOURISM

The focus of this paper is the post-Fordist, post-modern approach to the development of community social capital shared in most parts with stakeholders through the focus on community well being and the role that tourism can take to enhance the wellbeing for the majority of stakeholders. This project encompasses best practice experiences from case studies conducted in a tourism 'hot spot' in the environs of the first National Park established in the United Kingdom. There is some urgency about this topic; resources for community development are increasingly under pressure from both local and central government, with the expectation is now that local communities take full responsibility for that development. Wellbeing needs allocation of scarce resources even more sounder the post-Fordist regime. Two case studies' outcomes in this development are presented with a special focus on creation of a repository for the know-how and know what of the learning acquired.

Introduction

Much has been written in the past decade concerning the relevance of tourism to the creation, storage and retrieval of social, political, cultural capital (Altinay et al, 2016; Berkes & Ross, 2013; Higgins & Desbiolles, 2006; Macbeth et al, 2004; Putnam, 2001). A shared concern is that neo-liberal and market-forcemodels, resulting from post-Fordist consumerism and competitive advantage paradigms, have consigned tourism to the margins of national and regional development. In other words, tourism was destined to boost economic productivity (hence boosterism as a working title for one early paradigm) and was scarcely concerned with the viability, strategic planned development and measurement in the community of the outcomes of numbers of visitors travelling away from their normal place of work or residence for the purpose of recreation, business or entertainment. Perhaps our thoughts of tourism after the Second World War were quite confined to the business of mobility for entrepreneurs' profits and to the hedonism desired by those recovering from global conflict. Our thinking since the oil price shocks of the 1970s, and the widespread adoption of low-cost aviation in the 1980s with de-regulated aviation and the degradation of physical environments in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean has been conservation of the physical environment (Brundtland, 1987; Rio Earth Summit, 1992). It was not simply a matter of overcrowded beaches and cheap hotels and banal in authentic products and services for tourists; much more

theimpact of boosterism on the host communities providing a welcome to increasing numbers of tourists. This boosterism had social, cultural and political impacts on hosts as well as environmental impacts on so-called idyllic resorts where hedonism for visitors was at the top of a list of 'things to do' (Crick, 1989; Carr, 2002).

The interesting parallel forhosts included an awareness raising of resource decimation, of tourism enterprises riding rough-shod over both hosts' cultural and social norms. An upsurge in imported diseases was hardly new in the 1970s – mariners in the fifteenth century introduced diseases like syphilis, measles and influenza, almost with impunity, to host communities for five hundred years. Hosts believed that independence from colonial hegemonic influences would wane in the second half of the twentieth century. Unfortunately the dominance of the post-Fordist tourism business determined very much the economic and environmental focus of the tourism enterprises until the end of that century (Tisdell, 2000; Dwyer et al., 2010). Tourists contracted with big business to purchase and revel in resort-style enclave accommodation, entertainment and attractions in many countries that struggled to provide their own hosts with the lifestyle and quality of existence that were undoubtedly enjoyed by the tourists. The tourists were, and still are, arriving aboard wide-bodied aircraft to enjoy experiences in resorts where the profits were repatriated to the visitors' own countries along with the departing holidaymakers. Thus hosts' lifestyles, values and social, political and cultural wealth was scarcely improving during the post-war era (Vanhove, 1997; Rojek, 2000). The big players in tourism in that period were not even reinvesting in socio-cultural returns for the hosts in Spain, France, Italy, Greece and the Caribbean never mind emerging destinations like Thailand, Malaysia, Mexico, Tunisia, Morocco, Sri Lanka and Bali.

Bowling Alone, prepared by Robert Putnam (2001) in the context of the United States in the 1980s, highlights the plight of communities incapable or not empowered to develop a healthy and vibrant future for residents. Putnam recognised that the social and cultural landscape needed conservation and enhancement to preserve for future generations the shared social capital of communities through a conscious effort to work collaboratively. He also encouraged host communities to identify and share values and beliefs that would ultimately underpin regeneration and development for all residents as well as provide a base for concurrence on what could be further developed for the benefit of all – both resident hosts and their invited guests.Now we recognise the potential for paradigms established in health and wellbeing, specifically in healthcare, that provide a broad framework for driving the social and cultural capital accrual that will be critical for hosting tourism in the years ahead (O'Meara et al, 2002; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Huijbens, 2010; Kim et al., 2013; Voigt & Pforr, 2013). Our focus will drive skills for sustaining community capital and the infrastructure needed to support hosts and, in turn, as development broadens appeal of the destination community, to tourists. To develop the required

skills as hosts and as champions the acquisition of a framework to empower people in communities and to develop notions of partnership and cooperation needs exploration through a social wellbeing and health lens (Craig & Taylor, 2002; Wagner & Caves, 2012). Tourism businesses and organisations working in partnership for the benefit of tourists' expenditure effectively need to learn about capacity and capability to expand potential for benefits from tourism to accrue to all in the community; not just return one economic investment in the neo-liberal post-Fordist model (Ritchie & Crouch, 2003; Beeton, 2006). Taylor et al., (2005) drives the argument that capacity building and partnership building go hand-in-hand with increase of social capital and knowledge transfer from successful capacity building in the most diverse communities from inner city to rural village. Carolyn Kagan (2006) is also authoritative on the embedding of shared knowledge from capacity building into communities and between education establishments and communities.

Kagan et al. (2013, 2011) offers solutions through action research in psychology, using health and community services as metaphors for community health and engagement underpinning a tourism offer created, articulated, managed and reviewed from the grass roots of the community (Kagan & Duggan, 2011). Kagan espouses inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary approaches using environmentalism and sociological approaches (social constructivism) in her work therefore endorsing the potential to use learning from beyond business and commercial (meaning neo-liberal, market-forces) philosophical arguments.

There are several potential lessons to hosts from both Taylor and Kagan. The first is a belief that a healthy host community, empowered in decision-making and decision-support process and management, are more than competent to deliver outcomes that are sanctioned by the resident hosts and therefore fully ready for consumption and promotion in the market place. The second is that an empowered and fully-devolved model of endogenous tourism is a learning destination that will profit its residents, its present and future managers as well as delight its tourists (Timothy, 2007). Finally, there is no compromise explicitly or implicitly offered in the model that expects certain members of that community to not benefit from tourism in all dimensions; social, environmental or economic (Brooks, 2015; Fernandes et al., 2013; Murphy, 2013; Timothy, 2012; 74; Mulligan et al., 2008).

Furthermorethere is difficulty at present in determining for tourism policy and planning an integrative model that incorporates hosts' needs from a multi-disciplinary perspective. Effectively that means that tourism is on the fringe of development rather than at the core of decision making and support (Dredge & Jamal, 2015). Systems thinking, through soft systems methodologies (Checkland, 1981; Checkland & Scholes, 1990) also provide sounding boards for effective communication and construction of solutions for divisive problems in communities aspiring to better the lives of residents whilst stimulating the demand for tourism as

part of an improving socio-cultural capital base. In this approach we can see that good practices, shared learning and interventions from both business and society can contribute to solutions mediated by experiments attempted in other destinations. The process involved in systems thinking permits spirals of continuous improvement by reflection on aim, objectives, methods, management, monitoring, review and re-visit on going through out the cycles of improvement.

If we examine values and beliefs before committing to action we can plan for a sustainable model of tourism that is endogenous, engages many members of the host community in preparing and delivering the services that are advertised. The community can plan experiences that are commensurate with those values and beliefs and can commence a programme of learning and engagement that can support many residents and be supported by others who choose not to engage in tourism themselves (Sherlock & Nathan, 2008; Thomas, 2012). To plan for the future requires substantial investment in policies that support healthy and vibrant free economy-based communities. To develop policies that support business and generate a return on investment for entrepreneurs, commands leadership and a bottom-up, endogenous managed approach (Ritchie, 1993; Derrett, 2003). To clarify, leadership, concurrence on plans and policies and attention to the underpinning welfare of the host community are the most important pre-conditions for a healthy and vibrant service and product offer (Smith et al., 2010). A healthy community with many stakeholders' concerns at its heart has not always been the way forward. Too many privileged individuals sought profit for themselves at the expense of the majority of host residents in the past (Thomas, 2012). A disaffected host community will always struggle to fulfil the needs, let alone the experiences, of visitors to any meaningful degree. If the stories and storytelling of the host resident are not in line with the service and product being marketed the tourist will reject the offer and future visits will be jeopardised (Ray, 1998). Many destinations struggle to maintain the sparkling image that the poster and website appear to offer; often this is a result of the host not buying into that offer as the benefits of tourism are unequally distributed and the costs of providing the product and service offered are expected to be borne by the entire host community (see example from Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). Voigt, 2013, sees consumers taking responsibility for their own physical and mental wellbeing. This may be attributable to the devolved charge from governments to individuals to seek wellbeing at no cost to taxpayers. It may also result from a greater awareness in the marketplace by those consumers who are focused on self-help, self-development, alternative therapies and on-going personal or professional development (Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987; Ateljevic & Doorne, 2003). These two parallel learning and self-development experiences may well be informing learning across boundaries in many communities. These cross boundary expectations are not confined to destinations in more-developed parts of the world;

these expectations may well be universal (Bushell & Sheldon, 2009). Current publicity about wellness in tandem with tourism is plentiful from traditional sun-sea-sand destinations as well as from emerging markets. It is driven by demand from all sources and is tenuously supported by destination management organisations globally. There is no special sense of wellness or wellbeing as a fundamental privilege or knowledge base in the north or west; this is a burgeoning opportunity for all destinations to consider, engage with and emerge in competitive situations.

Discussion

This paper takes a socially constructed view of community development through the devices of continuing personal and professional development (CPD) through wellbeing. To do this it necessarily requires a situation and a context to which development can adhere and the factors surrounding the benefits assumed to accrue to community can be evaluated. A lens in CPD that might be useful is established in the systems approach of planning, action, evaluation and reflection (see for example, Friedman, 2012). To use this approach requires a focus from both the individual (as Freidman has done) and to evaluate the benefits to the collective, in these cases, the community spatially aggregated at two sites within the Peak District of Derbyshire. he first case study is the small mining town, formerly the site of large quarries for limestone and fluorspar, and earlier from lead, named Wirksworth. This settlement has a recorded history to Saxon days and is physically constrained by limestone hills, the River Eccelesbourne and the aforementioned limestone quarries, largely now defunct. Approximately 10,000 people make their home in Wirksworth. Half the population arrived post the end of the mining era (1970s); half the population is constituted of former mine workers and their descendants. Quite possibly the split between the bourgeois and the latter day emerging service-sector and retired is important when reflecting on the nature of welfare and development through the mechanism of tourism. he second study relates to an even smaller ribbon-village development largely to the west bank of the River Derwent called Matlock Bath which has largely been carved by ice and water erosion in the limestone. The two settlements are approximately two miles distant from each other and are connected by a B road and scheduled bus services. What is interesting also is that these two case studies are indeed apparently pursuing separate strategies for development of both the community and of tourism. The second case study has a very small resident population of no more than seven hundred. Together, both locations are visited by the resident population of the Midlands and NW England and Yorkshire conurbations as day trips (approximately 35 million potential day-trippers). They are also frequented by largely European and out of region British visitors for overnight holidays and as part of a wider touring route between the English South East and

Yorkshire and Merseyside. The potential for even more intensive tourism is rapidly being realised by marketing campaigns adopted by Visit Britain (VB) such as 'destination of distinction' (campaign of 2010) and 'the Grand Tour' (campaign of 2015). So the scene has been set. Two destinations, in close proximity, with a wide appeal to visitors largely for reasons of scenery, heritage, nature and adventure tourism opportunities and largely 'in tune' with campaigns to encourage tourism developed by the UK's national tourism board (VB).These two towns are not remote from other attractive touring centres with rich heritage of agriculture, mining, the landed gentry of past centuries and similar attempts to focus on wellbeing and welfare of visitors already repeat clients and potential clients from a global marketplace for product UK 'the museology' of the entire nation.Friedman indicates that benefits to CPD include perceived public benefit, including visitors, benefits to the tourism sector and related industries in the supply chain and to employers. In addition benefits accrue to communities form curiosity, desire to some sort of self-improvement (maybe more implicit than explicit) (Friedman, 2012; 54). In the review of extant literature the assumptions for better community health and wellbeing include recognition of accumulated social capital during the past century leading to better quality of life across a wide range of locally-based stakeholders (see Putnam, 2001; Beeton, 2006; Timothy, 2012). In the past fifty year tourism was largely perceived as a smokeless industry making a contribution to healthy economies deprived of other economic resource bases by the demise of heavy industry and manufacturing. This is so typical of the landscapes and spatial arrangements of these two communities.

More work is to be undertaken in the context of the wealthy North with its abundance of skilled labour, diversified economic activity and assumptions of disposable income to be shared for community's social and environmental benefits (again see Putnam, 2001; Altinay et al., 2016; Fernandes et al., 2013). In part tourism can be conceived as avoiding resource depletion as it calls into play volunteers, the elderly (retirees and those with shared knowledge for development) and centres for CPD including high achieving schools and colleges. There is considerable research conducted in the pursuit of health and welfare for the community through incremental steps being taken to improve our knowledge of how to build healthy communities by taking smallish steps at the margins of empowered and healthy communities, especially close physically to the research focus of this paper, in NW England around the conurbation of Manchester (Kagan & Duggan, 2011). In this respect all communities can benefit from improved physical conditions for communities at the margins of social and economic cohesion and productivity. These approaches are also inter-disciplinary as they take metaphors for social and economic improvement for community from health care provision and embedding new knowledge about how to fairly spread these benefits more widely.

Simply put, a healthy community will engender a better approach to telling the story to visitors and believing explicitly that the story will create stronger bonds between stakeholders based upon a recognition of the procedures to enhance an entire destinations' development based upon agreed stages in shared knowledge (see Ray, 1998). Through these two case studies we can review the collective achievement towards sustainable practices and the pre-conditions observed to achieve, reflect and document development. A systems-thinking approach allows us the varying inputs of vision, values and beliefs. These do change over time and do reflect the diverse needs of the resident stakeholders at both sites. This is an iterative process and requires active documentation and reflection to ensure continuity with the improvements suggested, the management techniques employed to realise improvements and the entire monitoring, reflection and action plans emerging from the dialogues and repositories created. *Table 1* refers to some examples of the specific development in the two case studies that are indicative of wellbeing progressively becoming embedded as new knowledge for the benefit of current and future learners. In case study 1 the development of a community enterprise incorporates strands of tourism, trade, arts and creative industries. In study 2 smaller scale partnerships are becoming formed (through a community interest company) that will incorporate spaces and places at the margins of the destination.

It is also apparent that actors employed in the reflections and management cycles are often changing. There is a sense of resources insufficiently deployed because of low knowledge of resources previously used and an exhaustion of key performers in this process as they are required to continuously upskill and re-acquaint with a knowledge base that is no longer in practice and is no longer current. That is exactly the problem that be-sets the two communities in the case studies. Moreover the focus is now on unequal distribution of resources with poor understanding of long-term outcomes of interest to the majority within the community. That brings the reader to evaluate the roles of public and private sector partners in achieving some type of sustainable development. These two communities embarked at different stages in their product lifecycle (maturity in both cases) according to the theoretical approach of Butler (1980). Unfortunately for the Butler approach there is effectively only resurgence and dynamic adjustment to changing demand (fashions, trends, and preferences in consumption) or decay and eventual collapse of the tourism offer and tourism-purpose built economic contribution. The actual model in *Table 1* is complex and multi-faceted. The research from health and sociology drives wellbeing from the margins (after Kagan & Duggan, 2011). The learning destination as an educative process with new applications in learning towns (Williams & Williams, 2011) defends the role of partners in the process of regeneration or resurgent community-driven offers for tourism (and other enterprise) and an explicit acknowledgement that universities and other reflective organised learning centres

(schools and colleges) must embed the experiments within communities in the curriculum and link the outcomes of research back into community governance. Addressing the new values and beliefs accrued during regenerative action is the next phase in the engagement. At this stage and during this action the purposeful and reiterative process of active learning on the shared goals and created identity is recognised and embedded more purposefully as a socially constructed process that is actively espousedby a majority of stakeholders (Altinay et al., 2013). The following stage embeds learning in governance and political process for a wider set of stakeholders who juggle competing demands from the wider set of stakeholders who occasionally divert resources away from community-led enterprise into supportive and medically driven survival packages for unfortunately dispossessed stakeholders. These dispossessed do not engage in education, do not expect to contribute to development agendas, tend to prefer status-quo and have no intention to actively pursue community development issues at a personal, or active reflective level (Craig & Taylor, 2002). We may consider this faction as disposed and disenfranchised (See Putnam, 2001).

A final stage in engaging the stakeholders with the outcomes is exceedingly important. Without the reflections and critical review there can be no re-addressing of vision and values; there can be little concurrence (within the majority of stakeholders) over stages of development and therefore reiterative action in plans and success stories cannot be embedded in factual accounts of development. The 'hearsay' of key players (movers and shakers of change) can be challenged because there is no documentation of success and failure and a reluctance to pick up on the development agenda and programme because of a lack of agreement on past success stories. It is the creation of an enduring repository in a socially constructed, systems-thinking reflection that must be highlighted to our majority decision-makers and decision-support librarians that has been missed in the academy (Guyer, 2015). Documenting healthy communities through praxis and reflections is critical to changing the ways in which things are 'done around here' for everyone's collective development.

Table 1: Communities of engagement:
Welfare and wellbeing driving specific development in tourism

Conceptual	Case Study 1	Case Study 2
Wellbeingfromth emargins (Kagan & Duggan, 2011)	Festival and Carnival – learning to combine resources to cater for a diverse new demand	Developing the events focus in a small community. Taking selected rural sites and applying new business paradigms to exploring boundaries – Mount Cook and the Matlock Bath cliff faces. The imminent formation of a new Community Interest Company (CIC) to oversee new direction for local response to managing tourism in future.
Embedded learning (Williams & Williams, 2011)	Business as creatives	Storytelling and the narratives Dedication to re-branding. Working to profile the values and brand of "Jewel of the Peak" or "Inland seaside" or "Mystery: My Village".
Re-visioning and joining (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Uyarra, 2010)	University of Derby as a partner – changing orientation from mining and quarrying towards a focus on the service sector and developing an enterprise culture The University of Derby and University of Sheffield supporting the community to retrieve and store narratives of cultural and heritage importance.	University of Derby as a partner – adapting to change in production and change in supply. Bringing non-traditional partners together to reflect community goals. The University of Derby to re-focus the Parish Council on relationship building with existing visitors (repeat visitations) and anticipating success with new markets aligned to existing products.
Indicators of success captured in long-term strategy	Better return on funded projects for all – Festival and NOW!	Non-traditional partners joining the tourism bandwagon to benefit a wider range of stakeholders
Reflections: management interventions	New OpportunitiesWirksworth (NOW!) ten years of interventions designed to promote tourism as well as arts and creatives, education, enterprise culture	Matlock Bath Parish Council – reflections on trajectory for stakeholders in tourism development.
Feed forward and enduring repository (Uyarra, 2010)	University of Derby Online Research (UDORA) and engaging the stakeholders in research	UDORA and disseminating practices to support enterprise and build on existing narratives in storytelling

Conclusion

Throughout this paper the comparison is made between the source of wellbeing in community and the extent to which tourism and visitors bring a sense of rejuvenation and development to destinations. There is a palpable tension for communities' key stakeholders in both serving a community and its interests and in managing a destination for the benefit of residents and invited visitors. The former requires stakeholders to cooperate and collaborate through networks and form and informal partnerships through a slow but deliberate process of social engineering. That is, new services, events and festivals and projects that are underpinned by bringing together diverse fields of activity. The latter is concerned more with managing visitors' experiences and exploring options to allow experiences to be co-created and embedded within destinations with scant attention paid to the legacy of the management actions involved. Healthy communities can only become healthy destinations with a reviewed focus on embedding newly created partnerships and resultant knowledge. Wellness through tourism directly benefits communities through a better understanding that relationships with visitors and their interaction and integration into the fabric of the community can bring. Indirectly, the outcomes of an inter-disciplinary approach using a health and wellbeing model (Kagan, 2006; Taylor, 2005) to the business management lens used by Beeton (2006) and Timothy (2012) is predicated on a better integration of the socio-political lenses now available to communities. Marginal improvements in understanding how the disciplines can be aligned to deliver benefits to host communities can only lead to a sense of wellbeing for hosts that promises to deliver on wellbeing for visitors as well.

References

Altinay, L., Sigala, M. & Waligo, V. (2016): Social Value Creation Through Tourism Enterprise, *Tourism Management*, 54, 404–417.

Ateljevic, I. & Doorne, S. (2003): Culture, Economy and Tourism Commodities: Social Relations of Production and Consumption, *Tourist Studies*, 3(2), 123–141.

Beeton, S. (2006): *Community Development through Tourism*, Landlinks Press.

Berkes, F. & Ross, H. (2013): Community Resilience: Toward an Integrated Approach, *Society & Natural Resources*, 26(1), 5–20.

Brooks, G. (2015): Heritage at Risk from Tourism, *Heritage at Risk*, 242–243.

Bushell, R. & Sheldon, P. J. (eds.) (2009): *Wellness and Tourism: Mind, Body, Spirit, Place. Cognizant Communication*.

Butler, R. W. (1980): The Concept of a Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources, *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien*, 24(1), 5–12.

Butler, R. W. (1980): The Concept of a Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources, *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien*, 24(1), 5–12.

Carr, N. (2002): The Tourism-leisure Behavioural Continuum, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(4), 972–986.

Checkland, P. (1981): *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

Checkland, P. & Scholes, J. (1990): *Soft Systems Methodology in Practice*. J Wiley Chichester, UK.

Choi, H. C. & Sirakaya, E. (2006): Sustainability Indicators for Managing Community Tourism, *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1274–1289.

Craig, G. & Taylor, M. (2002): Dangerous Liaisons: Local Government and the Voluntary and Community Sectors, *Partnerships, New Labour and the Governance of Welfare*, 131–147.

Crick, M. (1989): Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18(1), 307–344.

Derrett, R. (2003): Festivals & Regional Destinations: How Festivals Demonstrate a Sense of Community & Place, *Rural Society*, 13(1), 35–53.

Dredge, D. & Jamal, T. (2015): Progress in Tourism Planning and Policy: A Post-structural Perspective on Knowledge Production, *Tourism Management*, 51, 285–297.

Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P. & Dwyer, W. (2010): *Tourism Economics and Policy*, 3, Channel View Publications.

Fernandes, C., Raj, R., Griffin, K. & Morpeth, N. (2013): The Impact of Cultural Tourism on Host Communities, *Cultural Tourism*, 26.

Friedman, A. L. (2012): *Continuing Professional Development: Lifelong Learning of Millions*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Guyer, N. (2015): The Measure of America Approach to Gauging Well-being and Opportunity in the United States: Concept, Application, and Impacts at the Community Level, *Social Science Research Council*, Working Papers.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006): More than an "Industry": The Forgotten Power of Tourism as a Social Force, *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1192–1208.

Huijbens, E. H. (2010): *The Mývatn region as a Possible Nordic Wellbeing Destination*.

Kagan, C. (2006): *Making a Difference: Participation and Well-being*.

Kagan, C. & Duggan, K. (2011): Creating Community Cohesion: the Power of Using Innovative Methods to Facilitate Engagement and Genuine Partnership, *Social Policy and Society*, 10(03), 393–404.

Kagan, C. et al. (2013): Intergenerational Work, Social Capital and Wellbeing, *Global Journal Community Psychology Practice*, 3(4), 286–293.

Kim, K., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. J. (2013): How Does Tourism in a Community Impact the Quality of Life of Community Residents? *Tourism Management*, 36, 527–540.

Macbeth, J., Carson, D. & Northcote, J. (2004): Social Capital, Tourism and Regional Development: SPCC as a Basis for Innovation and Sustainability, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(6), 502–522.

Mannell, R. C. & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1987): Psychological Nature of Leisure and Tourism Experience, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 314–331.

Mulligan, M., Scanlon, C. & Welch, N. (2008): Renegotiating Community Life: Arts, Agency, Inclusion and Wellbeing, *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 1, 48–72.

Murphy, P. E. (2013): *Tourism: A Community Approach* (RLE Tourism), Routledge.

O'Meara, P., Burley, M. & Kelly, H. (2002): Rural Urgent Care Models: What are They Made of? *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, 10(1), 45–50.

Nunkoo, R. & Ramkissoon, H. (2011): Developing a Community Support Model for Tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 964–988.

Prebensen, N. K., Vittersø, J. & Dahl, T. I. (2013): Value Co-creation Significance of Tourist Resources, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42, 240–261.

Putnam, R. D. (2001): *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, Simon and Schuster.

Ray, C. (1998): *Culture, Intellectual Property and Territorial Rural Development. Sociologiaruralis*, 38(1), 3–20.

Ritchie, J. B. (1993): Crafting a Destination Vision: Putting the Concept of Resident Responsive Tourism into Practice, *Tourism management*, 14(5), 379–389.

Ritchie, J. B. & Crouch, G. I. (2003): *The Competitive Destination: A Sustainable Tourism Perspective*, Cabi.

Rojek, C. (2000): *Mass Tourism or the Re-enchantment of the World?* Issues and Contradictions in the Study of Travel, New Forms of Consumption, 51–70.

Sherlock, J. J. & Nathan, M. L. (2008): How Power Dynamics Impact the Content and Process of Nonprofit CEO Learning, *Management Learning*, 39(3), 245–269.

Smith, M., Deery, M. & Puzko, L. (2010): The Role of Health, Wellness and Tourism for Destination Development, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 17(1), 94.

Taylor, M., Purdue, D., Wilson M., & Wilde, P. (2005): *Evaluating Community Projects*.

Thomas, R. (2012): Business Elites, Universities and Knowledge Transfer in Tourism, *Tourism Management*, 33(3), 553–561.

Timothy, D. J. (2012): Destination Communities and Responsible Tourism, In: *Responsible Tourism*: *Concepts*, *Theory and Practice*, CABI Wallingford, UK. 72–81.

Timothy, D. J. (2007): Empowerment and Stakeholder Participation in Tourism Destination Communities, *Tourism, power and space*, 199–216

Tisdell, C. (2000): *The Economics of Tourism*, 1–2, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Uyarra, E. (2010): Conceptualizing the Regional Roles of Universities, Implications and Contradictions, *European Planning Studies*, 18(8), 1127–1246.

Vanhove, N. (1997): Mass Tourism, *Tourism, Development and Growth: The Challenge of Sustainability*, 50–77.

Voigt, C. (2013): Towards a Conceptualisation of Wellness Tourism, *Wellness Tourism: A Destination Perspective*, 33, 19.

Voigt, C. & Pforr, C. (2013): Wellness Tourism: A Destination Perspective, 33, Routledge.

Vorley, T. & Williams, N. (2015): Creating and Sustaining a Model of Community-based Enterprise Learning: A Participatory Case Study of Ready Hubs, *Community Development*, 46(5), 559–579.

Wagner, F. & Caves, R. (Eds.) (2012): *Community livability: Issues and Approaches to Sustaining the Well-being of People and Communities*, Routledge

Williams, N. & Williams, C. C. (2011): Tackling Barriers to Entrepreneurship in a Deprived Urban Neighbourhood, *Local Economy*, 26, 30–42.

Wood, E. & Thomas, R. (2006): Measuring Cultural Values – The Case of Residents' Attitudes to the Saltaire Festival, Tourism Economics, 12(1), 137–145.

Websites

Joseph Rowntree Foundation – www. jrf.org.uk.

PETER WILTSHIER | University of Derby
P.Wiltshier@derby.ac.uk