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Introduction

According to the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO 2005), approximately 763 million international trips were taken in 2004. This number, which has consistently grown since the Second World War, with only a few minor exceptions (for example, 2001), reflects all international arrivals for any tourism-related purpose. One of the most pervasive forms of tourism, and indeed one of the oldest, is travel based on cultural heritage attractions. While it is difficult to know for certain how many people visit historic sites each year or what percentage of the entire world demand for international and domestic travel is motivated by a desire to experience heritage places, estimates by the World Tourism Organization place the number at around 40 per cent, suggesting that heritage and culture are a significant part of nearly half of all international trips (Timothy and Boyd, 2003). Such an estimate would suggest that hundreds of millions of people annually visit places set apart as culturally and historically significant locations. In the United States alone, it is estimated that 58 per cent of (or some 85 million) US adult travellers included in their itineraries cultural heritage-related events or activities in 2002. In the same year, 41 per cent of travelling American adults said that they visited a designated historic site, such as a building, home, monument or landmark (TIA, 2006).

These numbers are quite astounding and illustrate the need for good management as heavy pressures are placed on sites, relics and structures inherited from the past. Unfortunately, most elements of the built environment are not highly resilient to the stresses placed upon them by tourism and other human activities, and because tourism is not always as innocuous and benevolent as destination elites or industry leaders claim it to be, there is a clear need for careful management and planning in the realm of cultural heritage tourism (Leask and Fyall, 2006; Shackley, 2001). This introduction examines many of the management issues facing heritage administrators by highlighting the most critical points of major concern among tourism scholars today. These include, among others, problems and challenges, as well as methods and approaches to mitigate the impacts of tourism.

Challenges Facing Heritage Management Efforts Today

Perhaps the biggest challenge today for heritage managers is scarce funding (Benhamou, 1996; Garrod and Fyall, Chapter 12, this volume; Isar, 1986; Navrud and Ready, 2002). Heritage management, in whatever form, requires an enormous budget. With diminishing public funds during the past quarter-century, heritage managers have had to be creative in finding income sources. In some instances this means requiring visitors to pay admission fees at places where admissions were not previously charged (see Austin, Chapter 3). This has sparked considerable debate about why the public, whose past is on display, should have to pay to experience ‘their own’ heritage resources (see Garrod and Fyall, Chapter 12). In addition, the lack of funds results in inadequate conservation and training for maintenance and repair.
workers. There have been many cases in which delicate cultural objects have been repaired poorly or maintained inadequately by untrained personnel, who often do more damage than good (Hills, 1997; Sadek, 1994).

A second challenge in Africa, Asia, the Pacific Islands, the Caribbean and Latin America is the history of colonialism. In most cases, the primary objective of European colonialism was to extract resources and accumulate wealth for the powerful metropolises. Once resources were depleted, or at least heavily diminished, the ruling powers departed and granted independence to their territories, leaving their former subjects in a state of poverty with few natural resources and wealth. While colonialism itself is an important element of the past that is often utilized for tourism purposes, it did considerable damage to many nations’ built environments. Many European overseas administrators had little interest in preserving the cultural environments of the lands they governed and were therefore less than enthusiastic about enacting laws to protect indigenous heritage. Much protective legislation did not appear until after independence was granted. In fact, in most parts of Africa, for example, heritage conservation laws were not ratified until the 1960s and into the 1990s (Mabulla, 1996; Myles, 1989). According to Henson (1989) and Trotzig (1989), this neglect allowed many important elements of the built environment to be neglected too long or destroyed altogether. From a more intangible viewpoint, colonialism also suppressed indigenous historical consciousness and cultural identity, often by heavy-handed coercion. This sometimes led to forgotten pasts and less importance being placed on cultural traditions and resources in favour of Western identities (Ayittey, 1992; Despain, 2003; Timothy, 1999a; Timothy and Boyd, 2003).

Modernization is a salient test for heritage enthusiasts as well. It is common for heritage buildings, for example, to be demolished in favour of new structures that have a more practical contemporary function (Eckstein, 1993; McGee, 2004). Development pressures are often so great that the economic rationale for saving old edifices does not outweigh the benefits of destroying them. This is the case even within the context of agriculture: sometimes the economic opportunities of agriculture outweigh the benefits of conserving places such as historic battlefields, which might, in economic terms, be better used as farmers’ fields (see Johnson and Sullivan, Chapter 16). Furthermore, members of traditional societies frequently desire modern changes, because they see preservation as diametrically opposed to development (Shackley, 1996; Timothy, 1999a).

Environmental pressures comprise the final issue to be addressed in this section. Several forms of environmental pressure were identified by Timothy and Boyd (2003) as having significant bearings on heritage site deterioration. The first of these is the use of heritage artifacts by community members – an issue of particular salience in the developing world. The utilization of ancient structures as homes and their dismantling to erect homes and other buildings present a serious threat to sustainable heritage management and conservation (Nuryanti, 1996; Timothy, 1999a). Second, human-created pollution plagues historic places throughout the world, resulting in the physical deterioration of sites that are deemed valuable by their home societies and tourists alike (Saiz-Jimenez, 2004). The third pressure is the course of nature, whereby sites and structures of heritage value are diminished by weathering, vegetation growth and other erosive processes (de Gennaro et al., 2000). Fourth, looting ancient sites for the monetary value of the objects they possess is a major problem today in many parts of the world. Such artifacts are commonly found on the international market and sold to private collectors via trade fairs, antiquities dealers and the internet (Brodie et
In this way valuable information is lost, and the holistic nature of heritage places is interrupted. Finally, but perhaps most importantly from the perspective of this Introduction, is the impact that tourism itself creates on places of heritage importance. Excessive numbers of visitors can cause irreparable damage to historic sites and artifacts (Gilbert and Clark, 1997; Simpson, Chapter 26; Strange, 1997). The most salient effect, and one that many observers have noted, is wearing away, or erosion. One needs only to look inside cathedrals in England, castles in Germany and historic homes in the United States to see the corrosive effects of throngs of visitors on stairs, walkways and embedded tombstones, just by virtue of tourists walking on them. Other sites have experienced wear and tear as visitors climb on, stand upon, touch or lean against, objects that are prone to deterioration. The toes and feet of the fourth- or fifth-century effigy of St Peter in the Vatican City’s St Peter’s Basilica, for instance, have been worn down to mere remnants owing to thousands of religious devotees touching and kissing them.

Similar concerns frequently arise over condensation caused by visitors breathing, touching and sweating in sensitive caves and near artworks. Hooper-Greenhill (1988, p. 227) notes that tourists bring with them ‘dirt and damp from an uncontrolled, polluted atmosphere into the purified space of the museum. The heat generated by their bodies and the breath that visitors expel add to the traces of impurity which will have to be eradicated after they have left the building’. Shackley (1998, p. 203) estimates that the condensation emitted by 125 people visiting the Tomb of Nefertiti in Egypt every hour is equal to the impact of 12 litres of water being poured on the walls of the tomb.

Garbage strewn about by visitors is not only an eyesore, but a danger to the built environment as well, particularly when soft drink containers leak, chewing gum sticks to the floor or grease from greasy food containers is absorbed into the stones or wood of a building. Litter and stains are difficult and expensive to clean up, and the cleaning process itself has the potential to damage delicate surfaces.

Vandalism is another significant danger that heritage managers must deal with regularly. Souvenir-hunting visitors exercise very little restraint when they pick up shards of pottery, bits of stained glass, or pieces of mosaics from the ground – or pry them from their settings. Breaking and chipping in particular cause irreversible damage, although gathering loose items also results in lost pieces of the past. Graffiti is perhaps the most common form of vandalism at historic places. This problem is especially difficult to address, because vandals’ markings usually become part of the heritage property and cannot be erased without resulting in additional damage (Chapman, 2000; Wallis and Blain, 2003).

All these challenges boil down to heritage resources being used negatively or carelessly neglected. Therefore, the need for conservation and other management actions is obvious.

Managing Heritage Places and Mitigating the Impacts of Tourism

There are many responsibilities involved in managing historic places. One of the most important is reducing the negative impacts of visitors on artifacts and structures. The following sections outline the responsibilities and tools of heritage administrators in their efforts to manage visitors and their impacts.
Seeking Funding Sources

In the past, governments were among the most generous fiscal supporters of heritage site management, but with recent financial setbacks, budget deficits and unpredictable economic conditions, reductions in public spending have hit the heritage sector especially hard. This interruption in funding has resulted in heritage managers having to look elsewhere for funding to survive. Cultural keepers have been quite creative in this regard, and past experience has seen varying degrees of success.

Several funding sources have been successful in the cultural heritage context, although they may not be the answer for all heritage managers in all historical settings. The most common is user fees, which have only recently been initiated in some heritage areas in response to the need to fare independently from government finances (Fyall and Garrod, Chapter 11; Powe and Willis, 1996). Fee income usually derives from entrance charges, rental fees (for example, as reception halls and so on) and car parking. Retailing is also becoming a more important economic element of heritage management (Timothy, 2005). Museum shops, bookstores and souvenir stores typically provide a range of heritage-related items such as T-shirts, postcards, books, replica models, posters, hats, mugs, pens, handicrafts, film and batteries. Catering and food services are another category of retailing that many heritage properties are beginning to embrace. For example, coffee, tea, sweets, snacks, pastries and meals have become an important component of the museum experience during the past 25 years. Special events are another option, and these can bring in significant sums of money, particularly during slow times of the year. Art shows, concerts and itinerant exhibits are especially popular. A fifth common approach to earning money is sponsorship, wherein some kind of benefit accrues to the sponsor (Casey et al., 1997; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Wigle, Chapter 31). Naming a new wing of a museum after the corporation that provides financing for its construction might be an example, or placing a company’s logo on an interpretive sign in exchange for fiscal support. Donations are different from sponsorship in that they are a gift and reciprocal arrangements are typically not attached. Similar to donations, grants are gifts from government agencies or philanthropic organizations, and, rather than receive some kind of compensation for the gift, as in the case of sponsorship, grantors usually desire simply to see the money used wisely for the continued success of the project or place they have endowed. Finally, interpretation may also be a way of earning cash. Some interpretive media, such as audio machines, may be rented out to visitors, and guidebooks and maps may be sold for a profit. These not only serve to assist guests in understanding the significance of the place they are visiting, but they also function as an important souvenir.

Conservation

One of the most important mandates of heritage managers and often the raison d'être of many public and non-profit agencies is to conserve the cultural environment. In Western societies conservation of cultural landscapes and other vestiges of the past is typically demanded by a modernized, affluent public and is therefore a vital concern that permeates all aspects of society, economics and politics, often even surpassing education and child welfare in socioeconomic importance. In the developing world, however, the situation is somewhat different. While the notion of heritage conservation is growing and becoming ever more salient in the public and
non-profit realms, there is still a degree of resistance to conservation efforts by community members, who find it is difficult to appreciate or even understand the value of conserving cultural heritage when they struggle to feed and clothe their families. In their minds, heritage conservation is an unaffordable luxury unless it has some direct economic value (Myles, 1989; Norton, 1989).

Conservation occurs in various forms, but the most common include preservation, restoration and renovation (Wall, 1989). In most cases, preservation refers to maintaining a site in its existing condition. It is expensive and very labour-intensive because it involves making efforts to prevent deterioration and maintain the condition of the site despite the modernization going on around it.

Restoration denotes some degree of reconstruction, or returning a structure or location to one of its former appearances. Typically, restoration involves removing structural elements that are not part of the original condition and rebuilding portions of a building or archaeological site that have fallen into disrepair or ruin (Gdaniec, 1997; Pearson and Sullivan, 1995). Critics of this approach suggest that true restoration is impossible, since the act of restoration itself implies change, and, furthermore, nobody precisely knows what conditions were like in history (Fowler, 1992). Contention sometimes develops among community members, historians/archaeologists and other stakeholders when decisions must be made as to which former style is to be restored (Wall, 1989).

Renovation indicates adaptation and is therefore more tolerant to variations from the original structures, although some degree of historical accuracy is usually desired. A common practice of renovation is changing historic building interiors while keeping the exteriors intact. In the words of Pearson and Sullivan (1995, p. 238), ‘adaptation must be limited to that which is essential to establish a compatible use for the place’.

Timothy and Boyd (2003) identified several reasons for the widespread desire for cultural heritage conservation. The first is rapid modernization. The very process of modernization causes people to long for the past in the sense that the past is known and understood in comparison to the unpredictability of the future. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries exhaustion as a result of fast-paced lifestyles and frenetic schedules has caused people to regard heritage as a symbol of less stressful and uncertain times. This translates into efforts to conserve heritage places and objects that link the present to the past and provide some degree of continuity in the future (Brett, 1996; Davis, 1979; Hall and McArthur, 1993; Lowenthal, 1996; Timothy and Prideaux, 2004).

Nationalism is another reason for vigorous efforts to protect heritage. In this case, places, events and objects from the past come to symbolize what is great about a nation or people. Much like nostalgia that is experienced on an individual level it can also be a part of a collective feeling of patriotism and pride in nation or community (see Uzzell, Chapter 30). Often elements of the past are conserved as a way of reminding people of their roots and the ways in which struggles were overcome to achieve nationhood. Thus, heritage is commonly conserved and protected so that it can be used as a political tool to leverage nationalism and patriotism amongst the population (Henderson, Chapter 14; Lowenthal, 1998; McLean, 1998; Raivo, 2000).

Heritage is also conserved for scientific and educational purposes. New discoveries or well-established sites are common venues for research by archaeologists, anthropologists, biologists, historians, geographers and other heritage specialists. Data and information
gleaned from such places provide a wealth of new knowledge and are important reasons for conserving historic places (Sable and Kling, 2001; Stone, 1994). Likewise, formal and informal education benefit considerably from visits to these kinds of sites (Cohen, 2004; Herbert, 1995; Millar, Chapter 21).

Often heritage is protected for its economic value, as resources from the past provide salient foundations for generating income through tourism, education, recreation and other service industries. In some parts of the world, the successful economic development of cities and small towns is largely based on their cultural resources (see Ashworth and Tunbridge, Chapter 2). Without an economic justification, conservation policies and practices in many places would not be established or justified in the minds of community members and leaders (Tiesdell et al., 1996).

The fifth reason remnants of the past are conserved is for their aesthetic or artistic value. Much like the scientific value argument, this perspective suggests that historic artifacts and places have an intrinsic social value, in large part simply because they are old. Heritage structures are often held in high esteem as awe-inspiring artistic and creative accomplishments that have withstood time in comparison to the ‘unfeeling’ and mass-produced edifices of today (Tiesdell et al., 1996; Timothy and Boyd, 2003) and therefore should be preserved.

Environmental diversity is another reason for the move towards conservation in recent years. Built and natural heritage go hand-in-hand as important environmental resources, and, although some elements of nature are renewable, built heritage is not (see Carter and Grimwade, Chapter 8; Millar, Chapter 21). Thus, conservation is essential to maintain environmental diversity and safeguard a non-renewable resource for its scientific, aesthetic and educational value for generations to come.

The final reason is the functional use of heritage resources. In addition to the other heritage values noted earlier, elements of the past also have a practical value. Many old buildings, for instance, are renovated and utilized for modern-day functional purposes. Old railway stations become tourist information offices, derelict border stations become museums and dungeons become restaurants or art galleries. All too often, historic structures are demolished to make way for new developments, so there is a vital need for planners and developers to examine the relative value of these places and give weight to their historic worth. Monetary value should not be the only value consideration (Timothy and Boyd, 2003).

Interpretation

Interpretation is one of the most crucial tools for managing heritage attractions. It entails telling a story, disseminating knowledge and explaining events or processes that occurred at a given location (see Stansfield, Chapter 28). There are several roles of interpretation and a wide variety of media that can be used to carry out these purposes. The most common people-based media include guided tours, special events, lectures, information staff and costumed itinerant personnel who wander around providing information about the village, museum or outdoor exhibit (McAndrew, 1995; Prentice and Cunnell, 1997; Sharpe, 1982; Timothy and Boyd, 2003; Walsh, 1992). Non-living media that are equally important and widely used include brochures, guidebooks, signs, displays, maps and self-guided audio tours (Bagnell, 2003; Butcher-Younghans, 1993; Light, Chapter 19; Sharpe, 1982).
All these various media work together to fulfill the two primary purposes of interpretation: education and entertainment. The educative role of interpretation is vital in the sustainable use of cultural resources (see Bramwell and Lane, Chapter 5). The notion of interpretation as education is based on the premise that, if guests can be educated about the significance of the artifacts and locations they are visiting, they will become more sensitive to the need to conserve and protect them (Moscardo and Woods, 1998; Prentice et al., 1998). According to Tildén (1977, p. 38), one of the early pioneers of modern-day interpretation, when visitors understand the depth of what they are witnessing, they will not willfully ruin it, because if they truly comprehend, they will realize that it is in some way a part of their own past. Through interpretation, the goal is for visitors to feel what the interpreter feels: awe at the grandeur and significance of the place and the complexity and wonder of the cultural landscape before them (Nuryanti, 1996). Of significant concern to heritage managers in the area of interpretation is how visitors relate to the media and how they perceive its effectiveness in their experience (see Austin, Chapter 3).

Whether from the perspective of formal or informal educational value, interpretation plays a vital role in learning, because the meanings and values of places are difficult to comprehend without the help of interpreters and interpretive media (Pearson and Sullivan, 1995; Timothy and Boyd, 2003). Formal education takes place when people visit cultural sites as part of a scheduled school/university curriculum (Prentice, 1995). Informal learning occurs as people visit historic places not as part of an established curriculum, but for other reasons, and learn from their experiences. These less formal ways of learning through more casual encounters with remnants of the past make visits richer, more meaningful and more satisfying (Knudson et al., 1995; Moscardo, 1999).

The second primary role of interpretation is entertainment. There is a widespread recognition today among heritage managers that learning can be fun for visitors. In fact, many administrators are beginning to appreciate the fact that even the most entertaining presentations have an educational value (see Light, Chapter 19; also Stevens, 1989) – a concept that has recently been termed ‘edutainment’ (Lepouras and Vassilakis, 2004; Mintz, 1994). Humour, for example, is seen as being able to retain visitors’ attention and make the learning environment more appealing, although care must be taken to ensure that the entertainment does not subjugate the facts and accuracies needed for effective and legitimate interpretation.

Scholars have recently identified some emerging themes in the area of interpretation that also must be addressed by managers of cultural resources. With increased levels of globalization in all areas, especially through international travel, the world is becoming smaller every year. As noted at the beginning of this introduction, international travel continues to grow on an annual basis, and a larger mix of certain nationalities, ethnic minorities and social groups are travelling more now than ever before. As a result, there is a recognized need to address the requirements of this growing diversity of clients in the area of heritage interpretation. The first issue is that of bi- and multilingual interpretation. When cultural attractions cater to the needs of foreign visitors, levels of satisfaction are increased and a better and more holistic learning environment is created (see Caffyn and Lutz, Chapter 6). Despite its immense importance, multilingual interpretation has not received the degree of scholarly and industry attention commensurate with its importance (Lehr and Katz, 2003; Light, Chapter 18). This is becoming an even more salient issue as more Western countries are being added to China’s list of approved overseas destinations. The Chinese are becoming more affluent and able to travel
overseas, and the countries of the West must seriously consider the implications of adopting policies related to multilingual heritage interpretation.

A second current issue is adaptive interpretation for people with disabilities. To satisfy legal requirements in most developed countries and to create satisfied consumers, interpreters must accommodate the special needs of people with physical disabilities. Harrison (1994) rightly noted four main types of disability that must be of paramount concern to heritage managers – namely, wheelchair dependency, hearing loss, blindness or partial sightedness, and the elderly and less mobile. Special allowances must be made for these visitors in the forms of wide, wheelchair accessible corridors, displays and signs that are printed large enough to be read from a wheelchair, audio or visual material for the hearing-impaired, extra lighting and Braille for the partially sighted and blind, and rest areas for the elderly (Cox, 1994; Hartley, 1995; Hetherington, 2000; Knudson et al., 1995; Pardue, 2004).

Finally, special care must be taken to ensure sensitivity in interpreting sites associated with violence and human suffering (see Lennon and Foley, Chapter 17). Interpretation at sites such as slave areas, and places connected to the Holocaust and terrorist attacks must be planned in a manner that will be acceptable to all potential visitors (Ashworth and Hartmann, 2005).

**Controlling Congestion and Traffic**

Crowd control is another useful tool for heritage site managers to mitigate the negative impacts of tourism. One option that has had some success, although it is not popular in all destinations, is shutting down during certain seasons of the year. This will allow the surrounding community and the resource itself to recover from the pressures of high-season demand (McArthur and Hall, 1993). Large groups may also be limited to less busy times of the day or week or groups may be allowed to visit only by appointment (Timothy and Boyd, 2003).

Quota systems have been adopted in some museums, heritage villages and historic cities in an effort to reduce crowded conditions during times of high congestion (Fyson, 1991; Orbaşlı, 2000). These efforts have had only a limited amount of success.

Dispersed routing, pedestrian-only zoning and other planning principles can be valuable in reducing vehicular traffic or redirecting large crowds to areas that are less vulnerable to wear and tear and pollution. The creation of pedestrian-only districts not only minimizes the effects of pollution and wheeled traffic, but adds an ambience that is often conducive to more pleasurable experiences and increased opportunities for income generation (Orbaşlı, 2000; Page, 1992; Slater, Chapter 27; Yuen and Chor, 1998).

**Pricing**

Pricing policies can also be adopted as a way of limiting visitor impacts by controlling demand, while at the same time maximizing earnings (Fyall and Garrod, Chapter 11; Robinson et al., 1994). Increasing fees during the high season and lowering them during the low season can result in a more balanced flow of guests throughout the year. This line of thinking also suggests that higher entrance prices may keep less desirables from visiting (that is, those who might be inclined to deface) while still allowing the more serious heritage enthusiasts to enjoy their experience (Darnell et al., Chapter 9; Leask et al., 2002).
Hardening Resources

This action entails reinforcing heritage properties and their surrounding environments to withstand the pressures of mass visitation. Some of the most common approaches of hardening are paving routes and pathways and adding supplementary infrastructure to help mitigate negative ecological impacts and provide opportunities for interpretation (Hall and Page, 2006; McArthur and Hall, 1993). For this form of reinforcement to be effective and indeed sustainable, special care must be taken to assure that methods and materials do not destabilize or compromise the cultural and historical integrity of the artifacts or structures. Implements should be environmentally fitting, natural to the area and harmonious with local cultural traditions (Booth, 1993).

Limiting Contact

Most museums and heritage places have in place devices that restrict human contact with historic relics. This is a common and practical method of reducing the impacts of tourism on cultural heritage. Roping off sensitive areas or items and covering artifacts with glass panels or plastic sheets are among the most common tactics used by heritage managers. Video cameras and itinerant security staff are also effective methods of keeping people from touching or getting too close to vulnerable artifacts, for people tend to be more careful if they know they are being watched (Timothy and Boyd, 2003).

Generating Mindfulness

In Chapter 22 Gianna Moscardo provides a valuable discourse on the idea of mindfulness in cultural heritage settings (see also Moscardo, 2000; Moscardo and Pearce, Chapter 23). Mindfulness, she explains, is a state of awareness wherein tourists are more sensitive to their surroundings and are able to process new knowledge and control their own situations. Mindful visitors are desirable because they are better able to appreciate interpretation and will value the resources being protected. According to Moscardo’s model, mindfulness can be created by helping visitors find their way around, making connections with visitors, offering a variety of experiences, telling a good story and knowing the visitors’ expectations, motives and desires.

Providing a Quality Product

Although many heritage managers and institutions refuse to admit it, they are an important part of the tourism industry, even if they see their main objective as conservation, not servicing tourists (see Ho and McKercher, Chapter 15; Prideaux and Kininmont, Chapter 24; Reussner, Chapter 25). Providing high-quality, positive experiences for visitors goes a long way towards mitigating the negative influences of tourism on cultural sites (Knudson et al., 1995). In the words of Pearson and Sullivan (1995, p. 284), ‘Visitors’ attitudes to the heritage place are undoubtedly coloured by the level and type of attention they receive. A pleasant, helpful reception is a good insurance against direct damage’. Suggestions for providing enjoyable experiences include the following: give good service, be knowledgeable,
be helpful, be receptive, be accurate, provide facilities and services for people with special needs (for example, people with disabilities and nursing mothers), offer sound entertainment, supply hands-on activities, maintain as high a degree of authenticity as possible, keep the facilities and surroundings tidy, and give visitors good value for money (Fyall and Garrod, Chapter 11; Masberg and Silverman, 1996; Parkin et al., 1989).

**Providing Alternatives**

As noted earlier, tourists love to leave their mark by way of graffiti or other forms of defacement. According to Pearson and Sullivan (1995), leaving evidence of one’s having visited a place is part of the tourist psyche, and often warning signs or other means of control are ineffective against this harmful behaviour. To alleviate this problem, Pearson and Sullivan suggest providing an opportunity for ‘explorers’ to leave their mark without damaging the site itself. This can take the form of guest books or prefabricated walls where people can write their names and provide comments, thereby leaving their mark to testify to the world of their visit. Likewise, providing high-quality souvenirs that are closely connected to, or bear a resemblance to, the place being visited may deter some visitors from breaking and chipping to acquire a souvenir.

**Practising Inclusive Planning and Development**

There is a rapidly growing literature on the importance of inclusive planning and development in heritage tourism (for example, Aas et al., Chapter 1; Ashworth, 2003; Boyd and Timothy, Chapter 4; Grimwade and Carter, 2000; Richards, 2001; Shackley, 2001; Sigala and Leslie, 2005; Smith, 2003). This approach is a more sustainable and democratic option than past management techniques which have typically been top-down and centrally oriented with all the control and power in the hands of a few influential individuals. Inclusive development is multifaceted and requires various levels of cooperation, as well as the involvement of all stakeholders, including tourists, destination residents, landholders, business owners, public officials, funding agencies and many others.

Stakeholder participation in decision-making is one of the most important actions in sustainable planning, particularly in the realm of cultural heritage (Timothy, 1999b). To be effective, all stakeholders, no matter how large or small, must be involved in planning decisions, policy-making, and development. This is especially important when tangible or intangible cultural features are being exploited as tourism resources. The populations whose culture is to be shown must be empowered to choose which resources might be used for tourism purposes and the degree to which relics, ceremonies and traditions should be exposed to outsiders. In most cases, such stakeholders are ethnic minorities and indigenous populations, who traditionally have not had a powerful voice in determining the course of their future. In fact, this consideration is crucial, especially when it comes to heritage interpretation and conservation, as the indigenous populations involved usually know more about their past than anyone else and are best able to demonstrate this knowledge (Johnston, 2003; Dyer et al., Chapter 10). Efforts along these lines have met with considerable success in places such as New Zealand, where inclusive management requires that Māori stakeholders
be involved in the authorization process to ensure that the interpretation of heritage conveys Māori perspectives and cultural values accurately (see Carr, Chapter 7).

Participatory development also demands that community members benefit economically and socially from tourism development (see Hampton, Chapter 13; McGrath, Chapter 20; Tohmo, Chapter 29). Although this might seem to be an all too obvious point, it is not the norm in many parts of the world where even souvenir vendors and guides are often controlled by powerful elites (Timothy, 1999b). Participatory development from both of these perspectives is seen to create greater levels of community acceptance of heritage conservation and therefore result in deeper expressions of value and care (Carter and Grimwade, Chapter 8).

Intersectoral collaboration is another important component of inclusive tourism development. This practice of networking between the private, public and non-profit sectors is important in sustainable planning to establish common goals and avoid having goals and missions that are in opposition to one another (Boyd and Timothy, Chapter 4; Timothy and Boyd, 2006). Cooperation between heritage attractions and destinations is also important if there is a desire to improve economic efficiency in promotional campaigns. Likewise, joint promotional efforts benefit all partner destinations or attractions in a region as it creates a larger, more appealing destination that is made more attractive to tourists because of the existence of multiple heritage places to visit.

Finally, inclusive development should also include cross-border cooperation between autonomous polities in the area of cultural heritage tourism. Historic places and cultural areas often overlap political boundaries at municipal, national and international levels. Heritage trails that traverse more than one state or country or indigenous cultural domains and historic sites that lie adjacent to, or across, political boundaries necessitate cross-boundary collaborative efforts in order to establish shared conservation standards, use policies and to share information (see Boyd and Timothy, Chapter 4; also Timothy and Boyd, 2006).

Conclusion

This introduction illustrates many of the management issues associated with cultural heritage and tourism, but it does not address management issues such as staffing, budgeting or marketing as these bear a strong resemblance to the conditions at other public- and private-sector non-heritage attractions. Instead, the focus has been on the more substantive issues that have been addressed in recent years, as reflected in the growing research literature on the subject.

Clearly, tourism has significant negative impacts on the built environment, although it also contributes positively to local economies and social welfare. Managers must labour tirelessly to protect the cultural relics in their care and mitigate the negative repercussions of tourism. This can be done through various practices and management tools, including funding efforts, conservation, interpretation, controlling traffic, pricing, hardening resources, limiting contact between visitors and historic relics, creating mindful visitors, providing high-quality experiences or products, providing alternatives for visitors to ‘leave their mark’ and practising inclusive planning and development.

All these practices and policies have the potential to contribute to the sustainable use of non-renewable resources. Although conservationists tend to have a strong mistrust of tourists, with sound management, tourism can become an advocate for conservation, not just an assumed adversary. When tourists learn to respect the historical objects before them, they will
be more inclined to contribute to their protection rather than to their demise. Cultural heritage managers must select the best approaches and techniques that will ensure success for their individual conditions.
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Abstract: This article examines a collaborative approach to the relationship between heritage management and tourism development in Luang Prabang, Laos. The purpose is to examine stakeholder collaboration and management roles as well as the interdependence of the heritage conservation and tourism development. The research examines a UNESCO/Norwegian government project, aiming to promote collaboration between heritage conservation and tourism through stakeholder involvement. Five aspects are explored: channels of communication between the heritage and the tourism groups, generating income for heritage conservation and management, involving the local community in decisionmaking, involving the local community in tourism activities, and an assessment of the extent and success of stakeholder collaboration. Keywords: stakeholder collaboration, heritage management, Laos.

INTRODUCTION

Heritage tourism is an expanding market that assumes the values of a desirable product and thus whose importance for tourism development cannot be ignored (Prentice 1993a; Prentice 1993b). While this
alternative provides economic opportunities for many culture-rich destinations, it may also represent a threat in terms of the potential degradation of a heritage and thus depriving a community of such resources and the benefits of tourism. The relationship between heritage and tourism is frequently characterized by contradictions and conflicts whereby conservationists perceive heritage tourism as compromising conservation goals for profit (Nuryanti 1996). In order to minimize these threats, there is a need for dialogue, cooperation, and collaboration among the various stakeholders involved. If a common ground between the different interested parties can be found, then heritage tourism can be developed in a way that preserves the resources of the local community and is beneficial to all.

Set against this background, the research here represents a critical assessment of a UNESCO/Norwegian government-sponsored pilot project at the World Heritage Site of Luang Prabang, Laos, that aimed to synthesize heritage conservation and tourism development through stakeholder collaboration. The project officially ended in December 2001. With the intention of enhancing collaboration between those with tourism interests and those involved in heritage conservation, UNESCO RACAP (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia and the Pacific), and the Norwegian government joined forces to launch a three-year project in December 1998 called “Cultural Heritage Management and Tourism: Models for Cooperation among Stakeholders”.

The project was designed to implement models for the preservation of heritage and the development of tourism as a local resource. The implementation was intended to form mutually beneficial alliances that were both economically profitable and socially acceptable to local inhabitants and all other parties, a philosophy well in line with the objectives of Agenda 21 (WTTC 1996). Nine pilot sites were involved in the project in Asia and the Pacific, and this research explores one of these sites.

The rationale for undertaking this research is that it presents a unique case study where two current themes relating to tourism development can be explored. The first theme is that collaboration and stakeholder involvement in the development process are increasingly being used in developing countries (Reed 1999; Timothy 1999) and Luang Prabang provides an opportunity to explore this issue in a country currently in the early stages of development. The second theme is the relationship between heritage management and the growth of tourism. The importance of preserving cultural heritage through tourism is receiving increasing attention (Garrod and Fyall 2000) and has been discussed in relation to sustainable tourism (Cope 1995; Johnson and Thomas 1995; Van der Borg, Costa and Gotti, 1996). In this respect, Luang Prabang presents an area where the symbiosis of these two elements is being sought, and lessons can be learned from these experiences that may be of value for future collaborative efforts.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to examine two kinds of theoretical ideals, stakeholder collaboration and managing heritage tourism development in relation to a study where these issues lie at the heart
of the tourism development approach. In doing so, the paper presents
the theoretical underpinning of the research in terms of the role of
stakeholder involvement in development, an examination of the inter-
dependence between heritage and tourism, and the role that stake-
holders can play in developing this relationship. Research findings
are presented in order to determine whether or not the project's objec-
tives were met in terms of establishing channels of communication
among the various stakeholders in the conservation sector, generating
income for them and management, involving the local community in
decisionmaking concerning tourism development and heritage conserv-
ation issues, involving the local community in tourism activities and
the extent of stakeholder collaboration. These findings indicate the
scope and extent of collaboration in the project.

COLLABORATION IN HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AND TOURISM

The fragmented nature of the tourism industry creates a recognized
need for coordination and collaboration in planning (Hall 2000; Hall
1994; Roberts and Simpson 1999) and many different stakeholders
have interests in the tourism planning process (Ladkin and Bertramini
2002). Cooperation and collaboration are major issues in the planning
arena. They have been linked to the idea of sustainable tourism devel-
oping (Bramwell and Lane 1999; Hall 2000; Selin 1999; Timothy
1999), and, in the context of community-based tourism, to integration
and participation (Mitchell and Reid 2001; Tosun 2000). Critical to the
implementation of the collaborative planning approach is the identifi-
cation and legitimization of all potential stakeholders, including those
who are involved in the planning process (Roberts and Simpson 1999).
In destinations experiencing emerging tourism development where
interests are not collectively organized, the identification of stakehold-
ers is a complicated task (Reed 1997).

The basic objective is to involve all those affected by the proposed
tourism development within the planning process (Jamal and Getz
1995; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Wahab and Pigram 1997). Indeed,
bringing various interests together is the first stage in establishing an
effective collaborative process (Timothy 1998). While there are many
definitions of stakeholders and collaboration, it may be looked upon as

a process of joint decisionmaking among autonomous, key stakehold-
ers of an inter-organizational, community tourism domain to resolve
planning problems of the domain and/or manage issues related to
the planning and development of the domain. (Jamal and Getz

A further complication is the extent to which the stakeholders in-
volved can represent the local community. Part of this problem lies
in the definition of the term “community”, which is elusive and vague
(Abercrombie, Hill and Turner, 1988). A community can be defined
most usefully for tourism in terms of a geographical area, or a group
of people with shared origins or interests. If the geographical defini-
tion is used, then the community can be defined as citizens within a
given locality. If the common interest approach is taken, the business sector is often used to represent the local community, with bias towards economic factors.

Despite these difficulties, the advantages of reaching a consensus within the tourism development process are many. Such a practice tends to avoid the cost of resolving conflicts in the long term (Yuksel, Bramwell and Yuksel, 1999) and mutual participation can provide cost effective solutions by pooling resources (Bramwell and Lane 1999; Bramwell and Sharman 1999; Healey 1997). A further advantage is that stakeholder collaboration adheres to the concept of democracy and Agenda 21 and thus legitimizes activity (WTTC 1996). Politically the collaboration process is more equitable than the conventional approach, as the views of stakeholders are as legitimate as those of an expert (Bramwell and Lane 1999; Bramwell and Sharman 1999; Hall 2000; Hall 1999). Furthermore, it makes use of local knowledge to make sure that decisions are well-informed and appropriate (Yuksel et al. 1999). This adds value by building on the store of knowledge, insights, and capabilities of stakeholders (Bramwell and Lane 1999; Gray 1989; Healey 1997) and gives a voice to those who are most affected by tourism.

A stakeholder has been defined as a person who has the right and capacity to participate in the process; thus, anyone who is impacted upon by the action of others has a right to be involved (Gray 1989). In this context, a stakeholder in the tourism industry is deemed to be anyone who is impacted on by development positively or negatively, and as a result it reduces potential conflict between the tourists and host community by involving the latter in shaping the way in which tourism develops (Swarbrooke 1999; Bramwell and Lane 1999). An additional argument for collaboration is that it engages all interested parties in the decisionmaking process by allowing them to take responsibility, enhance their self-reliance, and their own awareness of the issues—all of which enables them to enjoy a greater degree of consensus and shared ownership (Medeiros de Araujo and Bramwell 1999).

Set against the positive factors, there are a number of negative aspects and challenges to the development of collaboration. These include the added cost to planning and development (Marien and Pizam 1997; Swarbrooke 1999), the identification of legitimate stakeholders (Bramwell and Sharman 1999; Reed 1999; Tosun 2000), and the capacity of the stakeholders to participate (Medeiros de Araujo and Bramwell 1999; Reed 1997; Simmons 1994). Expectations may be raised beyond what can realistically be delivered (Gray 1989), and the power often sits with an established local elite and/or those most "vocal"; the silent majority and any local minorities may often be superseded (Hall 1999; Tosun 2000; Tosun 1998; Taylor 1995).

Addressing power imbalances is well documented by a number of authors (Bramwell and Sharman 1999; Brohman 1996; Jamal and Getz 1995; Marien and Pizam 1997; Roche 1997; Stolton and Dudley 1999; Tosun 2000). In addition, not all interested parties may have the required capability to be involved (Reed 1997) which is a particularly
significant problem in less developed countries where expertise might not be available (Brohman 1996). Furthermore, a major criticism of stakeholder involvement is that collaboration theory rests upon the assumption that simply by involving all of the interested parties, that power imbalances can be overcome. This ignores the fundamental constraint of the distribution of power and resource flows (Healey 1998; Reed 1997; Yuksel et al. 1999).

Furthermore, it is important to understand how collaboration works in different cultural and political contexts (Stolton and Dudley 1999). Tosun (2000) found that, in the context of developing countries, there are operational, structural, and cultural limits to community participation. Although not all of these barriers may be present in a destination at any one time, they can be significant difficulties in the implementation of a collaborative approach (Ladkin and Bertramini 2002).

The commitment to implementing a collective planning approach is reflected in the development of techniques that measure the extent of collaboration. Butler (1999), Bramwell and Sharman (1999), Jamal and Getz (1995), Mandell (1999) and Timothy (1998) all successfully conceptualized the different stages. While a detailed examination of these measurements is beyond the scope of this paper and has been discussed elsewhere (Ladkin and Bertramini 2002), essentially each involves a measure to analyze the stages of involvement and network structures that can be used to measure the extent of collaboration. In the wider arena beyond tourism, the fundamental work of Arnstein (1969) provides a "ladder of citizen participation" in which levels of participation are arranged in a ladder pattern with each rung corresponding to the extent of a citizen's power in determining a plan or program. In Arnstein's model, citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen power, and it is the redistribution of authority that enables those citizens who have been previously excluded from political and economic processes to be included in the future (Arnstein 1969). More recently, Rocha (1997) explores empowerment using the ladder analogy—to clarify the conflicting information on empowerment theory, assisting practitioners and communities to clarify and realize their own goals relating to empowerment. A ladder of community participation specifically for underdeveloped countries has been put forward by Guaraldo Choguill (1996), based on the degree of the external institutional involvement in terms of facilitating or carrying out community mutual-help projects.

The Interdependence between Heritage and Tourism

The relationship between heritage and tourism is well documented (Ashworth 2000; Garrod and Fyall 2000; Prentice 1993a; 1993b) and it is generally assumed that culture and tourism are interdependent (Ashworth 1993). Tourism to sites of cultural and natural significance has existed at least since the time of Greek antiquity as reflected by the Hellenistic world's invention of the Seven Wonders of the World
The growing interest in cultural resources opens new perspectives for the economy in culturally rich destinations which in turn provide the tourism industry with challenges of managing heritage facilities and attractions, and for public agencies (Jansen-Verbeke and Lievois 1999). Despite the relationship between heritage and tourism, there is recognition that the ideological and institutional context of heritage tourism is fundamentally different from that of general tourism (Garrod and Fyall 2000).

The approach of heritage organizations is to protect and preserve, while tourism has the overriding aim of becoming a profitable business. Therefore, the management is often characterized by a series of conflicts where conservationists perceive heritage tourism as compromising conservation goals for the benefit of profit (Nuryanti 1996). There is also reluctance by some managers to accept that heritage can be given an economic value. Garrod and Fyall (2000) identify two main reasons why this is likely to be the case. The first is the association of pricing with commodification and that heritage cannot have a measurable commercial economic value (Newby 1994). The second is the managers' ideals of the mission of the heritage sector whereby nobody should be excluded from the experience of visiting heritage sites on the grounds of cost (Curtis 1998; Leask and Golding 1996).

However, irrespective of the opinions of the different interest groups, the high costs involved in the conservation of cultural heritage make the revenue from tourism indispensable. Furthermore, the dynamism of culture in its different forms and expressions finds both incentives and genuine support in tourism (NWHO 1999). Consequently, the perceived mutual benefits drive both sectors towards common economic goals, and tourism, at least theoretically, offers the opportunity to generate income for the local community while simultaneously supporting the preservation of its culture (Peters 1999).

Fundamental to developing a successful symbiotic relationship between tourism and heritage is the need to involve all stakeholders in the development of the cultural resource, as there is a recognition that many of the problems are due to a lack of interaction (Hall and McArthur 1998). The concept of stakeholders is becoming increasingly important in heritage management and planning, especially the community as owner and custodian of heritage (Nuryanti 1996; Peters 1999; Serageldin 1986). It is crucial that managers involve the community to increase the quality of planning and reduce the likelihood of conflict, to ensure that sound plans remain intact over time, increase the community's ownership of its heritage through education and other awareness creating campaigns, and to enhance the community's trust in heritage management (Hall and McArthur 1998).

The tourism/heritage relationship includes several challenges. First, there is a clear need to establish channels of communication, as a lack of them provides a pathway towards uncontrolled and destructive development (Peters 1999). Butler (1999) proposes five levels of participation and decisionmaking power, ranging from the least to the most involvement. These are imposition, petition, advice, representation,
and equality. Second, there is the need to find the balance between conservation and the use of heritage sites for tourism. The widespread belief that the development of heritage sites for tourism purposes results in the commodification of culture is a legitimate concern (Wall 1997). Third is the issue of tourism activities generating income for heritage conservation. Tourism is perceived to be one of the core income-generating activities for many heritage sites.

However, the upkeep and management of the sites are often enormous and most of the money from tourist admissions often finds its way into other government projects (Tosun 2000). This, combined with global economic changes reducing state revenues, results in a need to find additional sources of income (for example, visitor centers with shops and a restaurant and sponsorship). Responding to these challenges, new actors from the nongovernmental and private sectors are playing a greater role and there is expanding participation by the local population (Stolton and Dudley 1999). There is still the issue of optimizing the economic benefits for the local community from the tourism/heritage relationship. It has been questioned whether tourism actually supports and contributes to the resources on which it depends (Peters 1999). Stakeholder involvement by the local community in the planning process is seen as one of the ways in which this can be achieved (Russo, Boniface and Shoval, 2001).

Case Study of Luang Prabang

Laos in South-East Asia is a landlocked, mountainous country divided into 16 provinces (Adams, Geok and Lin 2001). It has a population of 5.5 million comprising some 68 different ethnic groups (Hall and Page 2000). Since 1975, Laos has been a communist state and with an estimated per capita income of US$ 241 in 1999 is one of the world's poorest nations. Agriculture dominates the economy (although less than 10% of the land is suitable for this purpose), health care is poorly developed, and illiteracy rates are high. Some 70% of the land mass is mountains and high plateaus. The Annimite Mountains run the length of the country as does the Mekong River, which is the major north–south transport artery as well as a means of irrigation.

In order to encourage economic development, the Laos government has attached great importance to tourism since opening the country to foreigners in 1989 and has been actively seeking to encourage foreign investment in tourism (Hall and Page 2000). Laos received 737,208 tourist in the year 2000, an 83% increase since 1996. The government has recognized the need for ecotourism and high value cultural tourism so as to avoid the mistakes of its Asian neighbours (Hall and Page 2000). The current plans stress sustainable and socially responsible tourism development. However, Laos faces numerous difficulties related to tourism which are linked to the wider problems of economic development. These include poor transport and other infrastructure, a dispersed population (less than 15% living in towns), a lack of skilled
human resources, and a lack of tourism facilities including international-calibre accommodations.

One of the key tourism attractions within Laos is Luang Prabang, designated as a World Heritage Site in 1995. This town of architectural, cultural, and religious significance contains, among others, the temple Wat Xieng Thong, built in 1559. The justification for World Heritage designation is that Luang Prabang reflects

the exceptional fusion of traditional architecture and urban structure built by the 19th and 20th century European colonial rulers, illustrating a key stage in the blending of these two distinct cultural traditions (Eliot, Bickersteth and Gardner, 1999:6).

The UNESCO report identified 34 wats (monasteries) and 111 civic buildings for preservation, and classifies another 450 houses, making Luang Prabang the best-preserved traditional town of Southeast Asia (Englemann 1999). Under the UNESCO plan, there are three zones for preservation: the old town, a peripheral building zone in today's town with another across the Mekong, and natural zones along the Mekong and Nam Khan riverbanks. Statistics show that there has been an 850% increase in tourist arrivals to Luang Prabang from 1996 to 2000 (National Tourism Authority of Laos 2001). The accommodation stock is mainly small hotels and guesthouses but also includes two modern hotel resorts, each with 80 rooms, that were recently opened south of the town.

The Maison du Patrimoine (Heritage House), established in 1996, plays a key role in the restoration of the architectural heritage in Luang Prabang. It brings together several government ministries, and attracts sizable funding from the French government (ADF-Agence du development Francaise) and the European Union. No building work can be carried out in the protected zone without permission from the Heritage House, and the people of Luang Prabang can come for help and advice on building and repairing housing (Englemann 1999). The town of Chinon in Central France also assists the development and restoration of the town, and the town’s mayor has lobbied for Luang Prabang at the international level. The dominance of cultural attractions in Luang Prabang make it an ideal site in which to study the development of heritage tourism.

The Stakeholder Project

Luang Prabang is one of nine World Heritage pilot sites in Asia and the Pacific for the UNESCO project “Cultural Heritage Management and Tourism: Models for Cooperation among Stakeholders”. The project is funded by the Norwegian government through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation and has additional funding from the UNESCO World Heritage Fund (training and assistance grant).

The project’s stakeholders and beneficiaries are communities and individuals living in and around heritage sites, local officials
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responsible for safeguarding and conservation of cultural property, tourists to heritage sites, and the sustainable tourism industry (UNESCO 1998). Representatives from the local community as defined by a geographical area are classified as one of the stakeholder groups.

The project adopts an approach in line with the local Agenda 21 strategy, by creating and implementing action plans for the sustainable management of heritage and tourism at the community level. A stakeholder workgroup was established to be responsible for the running and implementation of the project. This group consisted of the Mayor of Luang Prabang, the Deputy Foreign Affairs Officer, the Head of Tourism, the Section Head of the Department of Information and Culture, the Head of the Department of Construction, and the Secretary General of the UNESCO National Commission of Laos. In spite of such a broad spectrum of officialdom, each of the group members has a full time job outside of the project. The latter member lives and works in the capital Vientiane and is more of an honorary member than an active member of the work group. The administrative structure of the Stakeholder Project in Luang Prabang is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. The Administrative Structure of the Stakeholder Project, Luang Prabang
The overall project has an advisory group consisting of the Head of UNESCO RACAP, a person from the Nordic World Heritage Office, and a person from the Directorate of Cultural Heritage, Norway. This group is responsible for the overall planning, contacts international experts on cultural heritage and tourism, and gives general planning advice. The overall project coordinator is located at UNESCO RACAP'S offices in Bangkok. A UNESCO culture consultant assists the stakeholder workgroup on site part time. However, it must be stated that the project coordinator had visited Luang Prabang only two to three times a year mainly due to involvement in another project.

The intention of the project was to develop test models for the preservation of heritage and the development of tourism as a local resource through stakeholder collaboration. To meet this challenge, the fundamental approach of the project was to establish channels of communication between heritage and tourism, to generate income for conservation, and to involve the local community in decisionmaking and tourism activity. If successful, such an approach could pave the way to the development of a more satisfactory and harmonious relationship between heritage conservation and tourism in Luang Prabang.

Study Methods

Primary data collection took place between June and August 2001 and utilized a survey questionnaire as well as personal interviews. The purpose of the survey was to gauge the knowledge and interest in heritage conservation and tourism development within the region and to ascertain to what extent the stakeholder project had involved the local community. The target population for the survey was residents of Luang Prabang town and province above the age of 15, who were encountered at the World Heritage Site. A local research team of four carried out an interviewer-completed survey. The area was divided into four regions, with each interviewer being assigned one area and a goal of completing 35 questionnaires over a three-day period. This gave a total of 140 completed questionnaires.

Within the sample size of 140, two types of nonprobabilistic sampling were applied. In order to ensure that community groups particularly relevant to tourism and heritage development were represented, each interviewer had to target four persons owning or working in a shop, three persons owning or working in a hotel or guesthouse, two persons owning or working in a restaurant or other catering establishment, and two persons owning or operating boats running on the Mekong river. These groups represented local community stakeholders with a common business interest in tourism. The remainder of the sample represented those who simply had contact with tourists due to geographical proximity. The two male interviewers were in addition asked to interview four Buddhist monks or abbots each. This "subject type" (Sampeiri, Collado and Lucio 1996) sample group makes up 37% of the total sample. These "typical" subjects were chosen with the intention of them being representative of the population. Second, the remaining
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63% of the sample was based on convenience sampling (interviewing any Laos above the age of 15 who was met in the street).

The sample characteristics consisted of 65% male and 35% female respondents with an age range from 15 to 60+, with three-quarters 20–49 years old. Half lived in the historic center of Luang Prabang, and three-quarters of the respondents had lived there for 16 years or more. The sample had a varied professional background, 30% business owners, and 16% working in hotels or guesthouses. Interviews were undertaken, in order to gain in-depth information from a variety of professionals directly or indirectly linked to the stakeholder project, on their perceptions and experiences of the initiative. Both unstructured and semistructured interviews were used.

Sampieri et al. (1996) claim that in certain studies it is necessary to acquire the opinions of experts, particularly in qualitative and exploratory studies. Therefore, the researcher decided to interview the primary stakeholders of the project in Luang Prabang as well as the project coordinator of the overall UNESCO project, and a member of the projects advisory committee. Originally, only the stakeholder workgroup was to be interviewed, but when it turned out that this group merely consisted of one key group, namely government officials, it was decided to reduce the numbers of interviews in the workgroup to two interviews, and include other relevant stakeholders in the tourism industry. The tour operators and the heritage sector, the Maison du Patrimoine, represented these.

An interview with a major hotel owner was repeatedly scheduled but failed to materialize. The two tour operators were chosen for their importance and affiliation, being the two largest in Luang Prabang (one national, the other inter-Asian). The codirector of Maison du Patrimoine was chosen as one of two directors who could speak English or French. The two workgroup members were selected for their central position in both the project and in tourism in Luang Prabang.

The five interviews conducted in Luang Prabang were all semistructured and took place in June and July 2001. All represent a local stakeholder group, and each interview lasted between one and two hours. In addition, two unstructured interviews were held in Bangkok and Oslo, where the subjects were chosen for their connection with the project. One informant was the overall project coordinator, the other a member of the overall project's Advisory Committee and liaison between UNESCO and the funding agencies. The questionnaire and interviews generated some quantitative data. However, both methods produced primary qualitative data that was essential in gaining an understanding of the complexities of stakeholder collaboration.

Study Findings

The survey of the local community and the in-depth interviews revealed a wealth of information on the stakeholder project and the development of tourism in Luang Prabang. The findings presented here are the ones that directly relate to the objectives of the project.
Objective 1: Establishing Channels of Communication. According to the private sector (represented by the tour-operators), communication with the heritage group (represented by the Heritage House) was rare, although both their agencies were frequent users of the local cultural heritage. The Heritage House, who responded that they had no regular contact with tourism, reaffirmed this statement, but they did communicate more widely with the community in general. Nevertheless, both groups maintained that they cooperated with each other, heritage through providing conserved and accessible sites for visiting tourists, and tourism through promoting and selling visits to the cultural heritage sites and other cultural products (for example, traditional dance presentations and local crafts). Both tourism and heritage groups agreed that their work leads to enhanced economic activity and profits in the local community. However, despite this, they did not acknowledge the existence of any interdependence between them.

Despite a lack of formal channels of communication, the tour operators demonstrated understanding and expressed a wish for communication. In contrast, the heritage sector, while acknowledging that tourism may be a threat to cultural heritage, did not see it as important to communicate or collaborate with the industry. They maintained that they were open for collaboration with anyone but underlined that their main aim was to preserve the heritage of Luang Prabang and its people. This finding is consistent with previous research that identifies the difficulties inherent in managing heritage tourism (Curtis 1998; Leask and Goulding 1996).

The above attitudes reveal that the tourism sector seemed to recognize the need to improve communication possibly because the importance of well kept/managed and accessible heritage sites is obvious to it. The heritage sector, though, did not see the same need. This could be explained by the fact that tourism does not yet represent a serious threat to the cultural heritage in Luang Prabang. Moreover, the Heritage House argues that as tourism contributes limited funds towards their conservation work, they cannot depend on it as a source of funding. These results reveal that in terms of establishing channels of communication between heritage and tourism this particular objective has not yet been met.

Objective 2: Generating Income for Conservation. One of the more tangible tasks of the stakeholder project had been to establish a local revenue capture scheme whereby the revenue generated would go towards heritage conservation and upgrading services in the local community. All interviewees confirmed that there had been discussions at the local level on how this could be achieved. Several options included a bed tax, a "passport" style ticket to the attractions, and donation vouchers from US$2 and upwards that would be promoted and sold at hotels. The latter scheme was the one finally approved. This scheme was implemented and consisted of a $2 bed-tax that tourists were asked to pay upon checkout from the hotel or guesthouse. However, there was
STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION

no plan for how this income would be managed or used and take up of the scheme had been patchy. This has caused frustrations for all those involved.

The project coordinator and the Nordic World Heritage Office believed that a lack of political will was the real obstacle to the effective implementation of an income-generating scheme. The centralization of authority described by (Tosun 2000:618) provides an operational limitation to participation and affects the local community, including the stakeholders, who consequently lose motivation and interest while waiting for a decision to be made. This has been echoed in previous research that examined collaborative tourism planning in Peru (Ladkin and Bertramini 2002).

However, the tour operators reported that they encouraged tourists to donate funds for conservation in a more subtle way through donations at temples. The Maison du Patrimoine confirmed that this facilitated small restoration work. The Maison du Patrimoine was also considering leasing land along the Mekong River to local people to run catering outlets, under strict regulations. The leases will generate money for conservation and restore activity to the old riverbank. Therefore, it appears that the attempts by the stakeholder project to facilitate the generation of income for conservation from tourism had not been put in place. Instead a voluntary initiative from the private sector (tour operators) was introduced that generated small amounts of income for heritage conservation.

**Objective 3: Involving the Local Community in Decisionmaking.** The survey of 140 respondents from the local community revealed that 1/3 claimed to be involved in an organization or committee that discussed the development and future of Luang Prabang, in terms of supplying data, giving opinions on decisions, or decisionmaking. From the 140 respondents, 14 (10%) were directly involved through their representation of an organization. The survey further disclosed that nearly all (96%) of the respondents think that local people should be consulted on matters relating to the development of Luang Prabang as it directly affects their futures. The respondents felt that villagers could contribute positively to the development process through their ideas. Only 3% felt that local people should not be consulted on development issues, as they were considered to be incapable of such things and hence not qualified to know what is best for the community.

These findings indicate that the majority of the local community was motivated to participate on issues that involved the future of their town. The stakeholder project itself did not specify the level of participation that was being targeted. But applying Butler’s level of stakeholder participation (1999) the levels of community participation found in Luang Prabang are mainly ones of “petition” and “advice”, and the local community are what Stolton and Dudley (1999) refer to as secondary stakeholders. Only a few respondents are at the level of representation (primary stakeholders) where they actually have a say and may influence directly what is happening in the town.
The stakeholder workgroup, despite its name, effectively consisted entirely of government departments. The workgroup members affirmed that it had never discussed extending the workgroup to include other stakeholder groups. The reason given for this was that community participation and involvement was a very new concept to the government. This is in agreement with other research (Ladkin and Bertramini 2002; Timothy 1999, 1998; Tosun 2000, 1998; Tosun and Jenkins 1998; Yuksel et al. 1999) that highlights that community involvement is primarily a developed world concept that often encounters problems when translated to the developing world. It was also stated that the local tourism authority (and possibly other local government agencies) had organized three or four meetings in which selected participants (for example, Abbots, the Hotel and Guesthouse Association, the Boat Association) were invited to discuss the future development of tourism in Luang Prabang. However, the meetings were terminated without conclusion, and final decisions were made that the government decided was the most feasible.

The tour operators confirmed that the community had not participated or been involved in tourism development or heritage conservation. Moreover, they felt that the local community could not contribute because they had no knowledge of either concept. This notion has been highlighted in previous research by Timothy (1999) in a study of participatory community planning in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, where local professionals did not think the community members were able to contribute to tourism decisions. To change this, the Heritage House tried to raise the community’s knowledge of local heritage conservation through presentations of visual material, with the aim of communicating the importance of heritage conservation.

The above findings reveal that neither the community nor the stakeholder groups in Luang Prabang truly participated in the decision-making process. The level of participation must in the case of the community be called “imposition”, and in the case of the other stakeholder groups, “petition” and “advice” (Butler 1999). Using Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of citizen participation, this is the third rung, the “informing” stage. The decision-making process was highly centralized, and ultimately took place at a high government level.

Objective 4: Involving the Local Community in Tourism Activities. The survey revealed that three-quarters of the respondents had contact with tourism, some formally through business operations and jobs, others casually through meeting and talking to tourists on the street or at the temples. As many as two-thirds of the sample had been offered a new job or business opportunity since 1996 (the year following the World Heritage Site designation); out of these 37% had started their own business and 32% had secured a job in a hotel, guesthouse, or restaurant. These figures cannot be directly linked to the stakeholder project but should rather be seen as a result of the rapid increase in tourist arrivals to Laos and Luang Prabang. The community survey demonstrated that most of the tourism businesses and employment opportunities in Luang Prabang had come into being after the designation of
the World Heritage Site. However, no evidence exists to demonstrate whether the increase in tourism is a direct result of World Heritage Site designation per se.

In terms of involving the local community in business and job opportunities, the development coincided with the project's objective of involving the local community in tourism activity. Nevertheless, the in-depth interviews revealed that there were no investment incentives offered for entrepreneurs or financial support; hence this situation was not a result of the project or any other strategy. The interviews also disclosed that the project had no strategy for recruiting, educating, or training people for the tourism industry. The government felt that qualified manpower was one of tourism's main challenges for further development, a sentiment echoed by the tour operators who confirmed that a lack of knowledge and professionals in the local industry caused the most complaints from tourists. These findings were positive in the sense that the local community was actively involved in activities and directly benefiting from increased participation. However, this was largely attributed to the rise in tourism in general, rather than through any specific objectives of the stakeholder project.

**Objective 5: The Extent of Stakeholder Collaboration.** Using Jamal and Getz's definition,

Stakeholder collaboration is a process of joint decisionmaking among autonomous, key stakeholders of an interorganizational, community tourism domain to resolve planning problems of the domain and/or to manage issues related to the planning and development of the domain (1995:188).

Using this as a benchmark when assessing the extent of stakeholder collaboration in Luang Prabang, it is evident that there has been no such collaboration, as there has been no joint decisionmaking. Furthermore, the aim of stakeholder collaboration is to build a consensus among stakeholders. For this to be possible, they all must be represented and have an equal say in discussions. This had not been the case in Luang Prabang.

However, Stolton and Dudley (1999) note that participation works differently in varying cultural and political contexts. The Western model and definition of stakeholder collaboration may not be appropriate for Luang Prabang. In line with Tosun's limitations to stakeholder participation in Turkey (Tosun 2000), the interview findings reveal a number of issues that have impeded the project. These were at a very practical level. First is the local organization of the project. The workgroup members confirmed that they held no specific meetings because of time constraints. This was largely because they all had other jobs, and no one was employed full-time on the project. Also, the recommendations of the group that had to be approved by the president of the group (who often was not at the meetings) were not considered to be final, but rather subject to ratification at a higher government level. This impeded and slowed down the decisionmaking process.
Second, problems with communication and motivation were evident. The project coordinator felt that communication between the workgroup and UNESCO RACAP could have been better. The contact person for both parties changed during the project, and members of the workgroup speaking little or no English compounded problems. There was also a gross lack of coordination among the government agencies, which made the project inefficient and reduced the will of others to be engaged. Third, the political system of Laos was not considered to be conducive to stakeholder collaboration. The authority is centralized and bureaucracy is decentralized and slow working. The government officials in Luang Prabang seldom had the authority to make decisions, and maintaining enthusiasm and interest among participants in a slow moving process is difficult. Finally, the project had suffered from limited funding. Both the project coordinator and the Nordic World Heritage Office mentioned that more could have been achieved if there had been funds for additional staff at the UNESCO RACAP office in Bangkok. With more staff on the project, they could have worked more closely with the different sites and given more onsite support to those who needed it.

In summary, the extent of stakeholder collaboration within Luang Prabang was minimal, and the UNESCO project has been unable to meet some of its key objectives that are central to the development of a symbiotic relationship between heritage and tourism. However, UNESCO projects at some of the other sites had been more successful.

CONCLUSION

This examination of the UNESCO stakeholder project in Luang Prabang raises a number of issues for discussion relevant to heritage management and tourism development through stakeholder collaboration. With regard to establishing channels of communication between the heritage and tourism groups, it is clear that in Luang Prabang, neither the public nor the private sector was accepted responsibility for beginning dialogue. Considering Laos political system, it seems appropriate that authorities at a higher level should initiate such action, and at the local level the stakeholder workgroup could assume this responsibility. The wider lesson is that although establishing communication seems a relatively simple step to take, it needs clear direction and someone responsible for driving the issue forward. Given the different agendas of the conservation bodies and the tourism industry, neither feels responsible for taking the first step. This was not necessarily unwillingness by either side but more a deficiency in the program that failed to introduce the systems through which such communications could take place. Theoretically, establishing channels of communication is perceived to be a straightforward and initial step towards stakeholder involvement. However, in reality, there are many issues to consider before this can be achieved.

The second issue relates to the generation of income for heritage conservation through tourism. Evidence from Luang Prabang shows
that the will of the local tourism industry should not be underestimated. As the project, because of what may be considered a lack of political will, failed to decide on and implement an income-generating scheme for conservation and management, local business created their own ways of generating small funds for this kind of work. This is a positive message for the heritage/tourism relationship, as there seems to be awareness of the importance of heritage resources for tourism. This is the first stage towards providing income for heritage conservation that will benefit all stakeholders. However, as has already been outlined, Luang Prabang has encountered the problem of an acceptance of the “user pays” principle (Garrod and Fyall 2000).

Reconciling the differences in opinion between the local tourism industry and the heritage managers presents a barrier towards collaboration between the two groups. Given the will of the local community to become involved in the development of heritage tourism, collaboration is likely to take place. However, its success in reconciling heritage management with tourism development is not enough. The attitudes of the heritage managers with regard to the issues concerning conservation and tourism need to be changed. All sides need to be convinced of the merits of working together to generate income for preservation.

The third issue raised by the study relates to involving the local community in decisionmaking and the notion that the right to participate does not equal the capacity to participate (Jamal and Getz 1999). This research illustrates the willingness for people to be involved, but also a lack of faith on the part of some that the community has the ability to do so. Clearly the message here is there is a need to raise stakeholder capabilities.

This is indeed a fundamental challenge in the stakeholder theory and process (Getz and Jamal 1994; Medeiros de Araujo and Bramwell 1999; Simmons 1994), as raising the capabilities will allow stakeholders to participate and negotiate in collaboration. While this does not remove power imbalances as identified by Hall (1999) and Healey (1998), raising capabilities is the first step towards community decision-making. However, the stages of “manipulation” and “therapy” in Arinstein’s (1969) ladder of citizen participation should serve as a warning against involving the local community in decisionmaking at a superficial or manipulative level.

Finally, the research reveals that many of the failures of the project may not be because of fundamental flaws in the initiative itself but in its application within the specific environment, exacerbated by the wider problems of developing countries. The broader historical, political, and economic conditions exert a powerful influence on the overall tourism development process (Tosun 2000). In a country where tourism faces planning and management challenges, as well as fundamental problems of development, collaboration may seem difficult to achieve, as it is these external factors that ultimately make the concept problematic in application. Ultimately, Luang Prabang has offered an opportunity to explore the theoretical ideals for both stakeholder collaboration and managing heritage tourism. The research reveals the
inherent problems of trying to achieve a symbiosis of heritage management and tourism development using stakeholder collaboration.

Despite the project not meeting its objectives, communication between tourism and heritage has been initiated. It has made people in the community at least to some degree aware of the impacts of tourism and thus the need for planning. The idea of formally discussing development issues across different groups has been established and may raise the knowledge and understanding of each other's views and challenges, which in turn may lead to a wider collaboration and formulation of alliances in the future. This is essential if the relationship between heritage conservation and tourism is to develop in a way that is beneficial for all the stakeholders concerned.
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sites, monuments, buildings or the industrial heritage, has many parallels with museum involvement in the conservation and interpretation of the natural heritage. Again, there is statutory provision for the protection of sites, monuments and buildings under a whole series of Acts of Parliament with the active support of a well organised voluntary movement. The protection of archaeological and historic sites dates from the Ancient Monuments Act of 1882 and more recent legislation includes the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953, the Local Authorities (Historic Buildings) Act of 1962, the Town and Country Planning Acts of 1962, 1968, 1971 and 1972, the Civic Amenities Act of 1967, the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, the National Heritage Act 1980 and this year's National Heritage Act. The voluntary movement comprises a vast number of organisations and includes the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (founded in 1877), the National Trust (1895), the Ancient Monuments Society, the Council for the Protection of Rural England (1926) and the Civic Trust (1957) as well as a host of specialist and local societies. Until relatively recently, museums have appeared to play little part in this movement although there is no doubt that their expertise and advice have been made freely available both to planning authorities and to local societies with good effect. Museums have also acted as local recorders for the Archaeological Division of the Ordnance Survey and in 1974 the Oxfordshire County Museum pioneered a new service by setting up a Sites and Monuments Record. One reason for this non-involvement has been that most museums have been town and city based, and that within Local Authorities planning departments have been given responsibility for historic buildings. Only since the reorganisation of local government in 1974 has there been an established network of County Museum Services with responsibility for sites and buildings included in their terms of reference. Leicestershire Museums, Art Galleries and Records Service is one such, which is now responsible for some of the scheduled ancient monuments in the county. At a district level, Portsmouth Museum is similarly responsible for the ancient monuments in the City of Portsmouth. Whilst the first Nature Trails appeared in Britain in the early 1960s the first town trail to be given widespread publicity was the Leicester Town Trail mounted by Keith Wheeler of Leicester College of Education in 1972, a description of which was incorporated in a special Town Trail issue of the Bulletin for Environmental Education. Brian Goodey’s Research Memorandum Urban Walks and Town Trails: Origins, Principles and Sources (1974), records earlier ‘walks’ at Faversham in 1965, Rochester in 1968 and Kendal in 1970. Of the 160 trails listed, sponsorship for
only twelve is credited to library, museum or recreation departments of local authorities and only two to open-air museums. There is no doubt that the Council for Europe's European Architectural Heritage Year (1975) stimulated much of the current interest in urban walks and trails and, the interpretation of the built environment generally, as European Conservation Year has done for nature trails. Other manifestations of this interest are the crop of Urban Studies Centres set up under the umbrella of the Council for Urban Studies and the Heritage Centres supported by the Civic Trust. Heritage Centres are designed to 'give as full an insight as possible into the way in which a community has evolved to meet changing economic and social needs and to enable visitors to see for themselves how this evolution is reflected in the existing land-use pattern, street plans and fabric'. The first Heritage Centres were set up at Chester and York in 1975, and there are now many more throughout the country. The concept of Heritage Centres and urban interpretation generally is further discussed in the excellent book by Percival (1978). Curators were encouraged to apply the principles of interpretation to museums by the publication of Museums and Interpretive Techniques, a report of the Museums 49 Lincolnshire County Naturalists' Trust—a display case in the Visitor Centre at Gibraltar Point.

Association Seminar at West Dean College in 1975 sponsored by the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust and by the two associated regional seminars at Canterbury and Leicester. It is not surprising that most response has come from the independent museums. Because such museums rely heavily on income generated from admission charges, they have tended to be more professional in the services they provide for the public, including interpretive services, and they have taken
the lead in the design of attractive publications, audio-visual programmes and 'living history' demonstrations. Also, because their staff structures are service-oriented they have avoided the fragmentation into the different subject areas which can take place in more traditional museums; with the result that they have been able to relate successfully, for example, social history to industrial history. They have also been able to incorporate artefacts, sites, buildings, archives and oral history into single integrated interpretive strategies.

Another development in interpretation owes its origin to the concept of the Ecomuseum, first realised in the Museum of Man and Industry at Le Creusot and described in the Museums Journal by Silvester (1975). In Britain the Ironbridge Gorge Museum, which aims to preserve and interpret in situ a complex of associated industrial sites and monuments and to integrate them with a living community, was the first to be established on similar
lines. Its success has encouraged many
others to adopt this approach. Thus, the
Torfaen Museum at Blaenafon sets out to
interpret and conserve the industrial
heritage of a Welsh valley, and the Black
Country Museum the industrial history of
Dudley through a working open-air
museum.
Some museums, again mostly
independent, have concerned themselves
with specific industries as, coalmining at the
Chatterley Whitfield Mining Museum, cider
making at the Museum of Cider at
Hereford, brewing at the Bass Museum of
Brewing at Burton-upon-Trent, pottery
making at the Gladstone Pottery Museum,
50 and salt manufacture at the Salt Museum at Nantwich. Other specialised museums include the National Tramway Museum at Crich, the Ellesmere Boat Museum at Ellesmere Port in Cheshire, the Windermere Steamboat Museum at Bowness on Windermere, and the Weald and Downland Museum and the Avoncroft Museum of Buildings which were both set up to preserve buildings. There have been similar developments in the local authority sector. Beamish Open Air Museum, financed by a consortium of local authorities, aims to interpret a distinctive region of north-eastern England. A working colliery, farm and tramway already in operation form part of an ambitious scheme to re-create a whole township. The Acton Scott Working Farm Museum at Much Wenlock, administered by the Shropshire County Museum Service, is as its name suggests a working farm of the nineteenth century complete with four-course crop rotation arable farming and horse-drawn machinery. There have also been innovations in the form of 'living history'. The
Elvaston Castle Museum in Derbyshire combines displays and demonstrations around the original workshops and cottage of an estate of the early twentieth century. Oxfordshire County Museum has re-created a working Victorian farm at Manor Farm at Witney together with a modern farm exhibition, and Staffordshire County Museum maintains a working farm at Shugborough with a breeding programme of rare breeds of domestic animals. Within national museums, the National Museum of Wales is unique in that it has maintained outposts throughout Wales for many years. These now include a museum of the Woollen Industry, at Dre-fach Felindre, slate working at the Welsh Slate Museum at Llanberis, Roman sites at Caerleon and Segontium and, the most recent venture, Oriel Eryri, an Environmental Centre also at Llanberis in North Wales. Museums have also responded in other ways. Those which administer historic houses such as Blakesley Hall in Birmingham and Tredegar House at Newport now give more attention to the historic integrity of the building and to its interpretation. Derby and Bradford are two museums which have established city trails and at Leeds there is a Museum of Leeds Trail in four sections covering a distance of nine miles which includes museums, bridges, railways, the canal and architectural features. In contrast to the interpretation of the natural heritage there have been few new exhibitions which aim to provide a focus for the archaeological or historical interpretation of a region. Outside the traditional museum field, the Department of the Environment, which is responsible for 400 monuments scattered throughout England (in 1982 these attracted more than ten million visitors), has recently refurbished the Alexander Keiller Museum at Avebury, the Viroconium Museum at Wroxeter, the Cistercian Museum at Hailes Abbey and a new museum at Housteads Roman Fort. It has installed new exhibitions at Carlisle Castle, Beeston Castle and Tintern Abbey and new graphics at Scarborough Castle, Battle Abbey and Caistor Roman Site. The most important innovation in interpretation, however, has been the introduction of interpretive planning on a local and regional scale. The Countryside Commission sponsored the Hadrian’s Wall study in 1976, the Exmoor National Park Interpretive Plan in 1979 and the Interpretive Plan for Nottinghamshire in 1979. The Dartington Amenity Research Trust was commissioned to produce interpretive plans for Shipley Park in Derbyshire (1975), the Derwent Valley, also in Derbyshire (1979) and on the maritime heritage of Portsmouth (Defence of the Realm), also in 1979. The latter plan is of particular interest in that it incorporates castles, fortifications, historic ships, guns, artefacts and documents into one master plan in which museums play a vital role. Regional
interpretive plans have been prepared throughout Scotland by the Countryside Commission for Scotland, and the Centre for Environmental Interpretation has recently produced an interpretive plan for Wirksworth in Derbyshire. Interpretive planning involves setting objectives, surveying resources and making the most effective use of available media. The new interpretive movement has been characterised by the tremendous amount of imagination which has been applied to the various aspects of interpretation to the extent that it is almost impossible to review them. Some idea may however be gained by a perusal of SIBH Newsletters and the Annual Reports of the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust. To take one example, however, the use of theatre and drama for historic interpretation as introduced at Sudbury Hall in Derbyshire and now continued by the National Trust Young People's Theatre has been used successfully in many interpretative situations including Glastonbury Museum and even in the Christmas programmes at the British Museum (Natural History), and has provided a whole new dimension for interpretation. It is likely that more changes will occur in the immediate future. The National Museum of Wales. Llanberis, just recent outpost of the Heritage Act passed this spring provides for the setting-up of a Commission for Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings to exercise functions concerning ancient monuments and historic buildings. The reasons behind this, put forward first in a DoE consultative paper last year, are that the creation of a new agency 'would place ancient monuments and historic buildings in the same relationship to Government as has proved effective in analogous fields such as
museums and the arts: and an organisation
devoted entirely to the heritage would thus
be better able to focus single-mindedly on
the functions currently being carried out by
the Department of the Environment and
command a greater respect in the heritage
field. There is also the possibility of helping
to provide the increasingly large amounts of
money required to preserve buildings and
monuments by tapping the abundant
goodwill in this area through private
donations. A further reason for change is the
need to bring more professional expertise to
the promotional and commercial side of
monuments operation. The income
generated by admission charges, sales of
souvenirs, etc, has in the past provided only
a small proportion of the money necessary
for the upkeep of this part of the national
heritage. However, with the growth of the
importance of tourism to this country the
government considers that a more
imaginative approach to promoting
monuments could lead to much more
income being generated. The kind of
expertise needed for this approach, calling for commercial and entrepreneurial flair, is more appropriately located and developed in a body at arm's length from a government department'.

With appropriate safeguards these provisions could lead to a much higher standard of interpretation of ancient monuments and historic buildings than the present small staff have been able to accomplish, and the proposals have been welcomed in principal by both the Museums Association and the Society for
29 Economic Impacts of Cultural Events on Local Economies: An Input-Output Analysis of the Kaustinen Folk Music Festival
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture of transport equipment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture of furniture, recycling</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas and heat supply</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection, purification and distribution of water</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and maintenance of railways, highways and roads</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and auxiliary transport activities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post and telecommunications</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial intermediation</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting and business activities</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence: compulsory social security</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social work</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community, social and personal service activities</td>
<td>0.2412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1475</td>
<td>0.2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3716</td>
<td>0.1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1022</td>
<td>0.0525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2335</td>
<td>0.1559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0582</td>
<td>0.0643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0458</td>
<td>0.0550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0406</td>
<td>0.0991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0003</td>
<td>-0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0006</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0008</td>
<td>-0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3419</td>
<td>0.4153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0858</td>
<td>0.3435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0349</td>
<td>-0.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0023</td>
<td>-0.0161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0127</td>
<td>0.5313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft. 0.3620</td>
<td>0.3522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>