Boundaries and boundary crossing in tourism: A study of policy work for tourism and urban regeneration

Seonyoung Kim, Bill Bramwell*

Sheffield Business School, Sheffield Hallam University, Howard Street, Sheffield, S1 1WB, UK

ABSTRACT

The paper argues for a research focus on understanding varied boundary relations in society, including social, political, geographical and discursive relations. Analytical themes are established for the study of tourism's boundary relations: the salience and permeability of boundaries, discursive boundaries, power relations associated with boundaries, and learning within and across boundaries. Particular attention is given to concepts of learning: identification, reflection, coordination and transformation. These themes and concepts are employed to explore boundary relations of the tourism and other urban regeneration policy sectors in two city districts. Cross-boundary learning across the tourism and urban regeneration policy sectors occurred through the identification of, and reflection about, tourism's role in urban regeneration and led to coordination and possibly some transformation. Yet this was within significant limitations and barriers. There was perhaps scope for more regular and comprehensive boundary crossing between the tourism and urban regeneration policy sectors.

1. Introduction

This paper examines societal boundaries and boundary crossing involved in the governance of tourism development. There is growing research interest in tourism governance – the governing, steering, regulating or mobilising of action associated with tourism policy work in destinations (Jamal & Camargo, 2018; Volgger, Pechlaner, & Pichler, 2017). Tourism governance is a political process involving government and other actors (Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Nunkoo, 2017), which is affected by actors' differing interests and by contestation over varying beliefs, values and priorities. It is the paper's assertion that there is much value in examining tourism governance, and tourism in general, through an explicit focus on society's different boundary relations, including social, political, geographical and discursive relations. There is an emerging social science literature – particularly the work of Akkerman and Bakker (2011) – explicitly focused on developing shared analytical themes and concepts for assessing different types of societal boundaries and boundary crossing processes (Mayrl & Quinn, 2016). Much social science research in the past has also explored issues and concepts associated with societal boundaries. The paper makes an original contribution by explicitly focusing on boundaries and boundary crossing for a specific aspect of tourism governance: boundary relations between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors.

An emerging body of social science literature indicates the value of a research focus on the boundaries that help to structure varied social relations (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011; Packucki, Pendergrass, & Lamont, 2007; Quick & Feldman, 2014; Tilly, 2004). Lamont and Molnár (2002, p. 167) assert that "In recent years, the idea of 'boundaries' has come to play a key role in important new lines of scholarship across the social sciences". Mayrl and Quinn (2016, p. 5) also note an emerging "explosion of work, in diverse fields, exploring how boundaries work in social life".

This body of social science work suggests that the boundaries involved in societal relations are "differences that give rise to discontinuities in interaction and action" (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011, p. 139). These boundaries are regarded as usually only partial as there are varying levels of interaction and other relations that cross them. It is suggested that it is important to understand society's boundaries because they delimit different entities, meaning systems and processes in society. Boundaries indicate, for example, the extent of rigidness or of social integration in society. It is necessary, therefore, to appreciate the extent to which societal boundaries are permeable and also the character of relations across the boundaries. Boundary crossing occurs when actors learn about the character of different activity systems and when they interact across the activity system boundaries. The crossing of societal boundaries can be social, perceptual, symbolic or discursive (Abbott, 1995; Gieryn, 1983; Lamont & Molnár, 2002).

The emerging literature on societal boundaries and boundary

---

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: seonyoung.kim@shu.ac.uk (S. Kim), w.m.bramwell@shu.ac.uk (B. Bramwell).

crossing indicates that there can be research benefits from the use of shared questions – or analytical themes – and concepts to examine different types of boundaries and boundary crossing processes in society (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011; Lamont & Molnár, 2002; Mayrl & Quinn, 2016). Such a shared research frame of boundaries and boundary crossing across social science topics offers potential to develop new interpretations, build bridges of understanding across different research fields, and establish similarities and differences in the character of boundary relationships for differing social entities. Further, it provides a way to bring together previous research from across the social sciences that has also explored issues and concepts associated with societal boundaries.

Researching boundary relations using shared analytical themes and concepts seems important when commentators have argued that boundaries are becoming increasingly fluid in advanced capitalist societies. The sociologists Lash and Urry (1994, p. 272) contend that societal restructuring from the 1980s has led to what they describe as "de-differentiation", or "a breakdown of the distinctiveness of each sphere and of the criteria which legislate within each vertical dimension". This entails an erosion of distinct spheres of activity (such as work and leisure) or spheres of engagement (such as real and imagined), producing new societal patterns. They suggest that this has been encouraged by the compression of space-time relations associated with globalisation. In a discussion of relationships between society's leisure, recreation and tourism spheres, Williams (2009, p. 7) similarly contends that in more recent years "rather than viewing each sphere as a discrete and clearly delineated zone of practice and experience, it is more meaningful to emphasise the permeability of boundaries…and hence a fluidity in the relationships between the different elements".

Alongside such de-differentiation between societal spheres, other societal distinctions or boundaries may have grown. For example, while capitalist wealth creation has spread some wealth to new places since the 1980s – to a degree creating a "flatter" world – this dispersal of wealth has become more "spiky" (Florida, 2005, p. 48), with the wealth gains unevenly distributed between places and social groups (Harding & Blokland, 2014). Commentators also point to recent growing perceptual, social and even physical boundaries or barriers in some countries due to heightened concern about mass migration and also a resurgence in nationalism (Kershaw, 2018).

Boundary crossing is vital for tourism as it entails high levels of movement, perception and reflection across varied activity system boundaries. Tourism occurs through tourists travelling to the places or destinations where their experiences are produced and consumed, and thus tourists enter and affect the economy, society and environments of destinations. Urry and Larsen (2011), for example, assert that tourism is becoming increasingly de-differentiated within societal relations, which suggests that it is more intertwined with, rather than separate from, daily practices and routine daily life. This may be reflected in some tourists searching more often for leisure experiences while on vacation that are in residential neighbourhoods away from tourist enclaves, and for holiday accommodation in those neighbourhoods which is owned by local residents (Nieuwland & Melik, 2018).

Tourism's boundary relations can have positive and also negative consequences. In terms of positive results, actors involved in tourism policy work might work across boundaries in order to avoid fragmented policies, share information and resources, and widen participation in policy-making (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011; Quick & Feldman, 2011 & 2014). Carlile (2004, p. 566) also suggests that "managing knowledge across the various types of boundaries in an organization" can lead to organisations gaining "competitive advantage", and this can apply for tourism organisations. Further, working across boundaries may support a tourism organisation's resilience by creating more varied connections, and thereby multiplying the options for action (Quick & Feldman, 2014). Boundary crossing in tourism may also result in negative impacts and conflicts, such as from the exploitation of individuals and social groups by powerful businesses or from clashes around the

differing perspectives of tourists and destination residents. If, for instance, more tourists seek to stay in accommodation in residential neighbourhoods, then that could have the negative impact of increasing property prices and rental costs for destination residents (Nieuwland & Melik, 2018).

Research is needed, therefore, which explores tourism's many boundary relationships. Among these are its host-guest interactions, the assembling together of different tourism-related experiences, the co-production of tourist experiences by both producers and consumers, the relationships in destinations around spaces used by tourists and those used by locals, and the interactions among the many actors involved with tourism, including in the diverse policy sectors that affect it.

This study identifies analytical themes and concepts for assessing diverse kinds of societal boundaries, with these then used to assess relations between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors. Policy sectors are the domains of governance where policies are decided, and they are also the societal domains that policy makers try to affect (Sjostedt & Kleinschmit, 2016). Policy sectors have substantive names, such as public health, agriculture, transportation and regional development (Runhaar, 2016). The tourism policy sector includes policymakers, policies and socio-economic and other activities directly and substantially involved in tourism. It is often suggested that it is necessary to cross the boundaries between policy sectors in order that policy responses to complex societal problems are made effectively (Bevir, 2009; Manente, Minghetti, & Montaguti, 2013). The rationale for this is that comprehensive and coordinated policy responses are unlikely to be achieved when policy making and policy implementation occur within rigidly separate, silo-like policy sectors.

When tourism researchers previously have looked at boundary crossing between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors they have often relied on political science ideas about policy integration and coordination (Dredge & Jenkins, 2007; Longjit & Pearce, 2013). Such tourism policy studies tend not to focus explicitly on developing shared analytical themes and concepts for assessing diverse types of societal boundaries and boundary crossing (Abbott, 1995), including for socio-economic, cultural, political, discursive and geographical boundaries.

Boundary relations are examined in this paper for the specific case of the tourism policy sector and other related policy sectors concerned with urban regeneration or revitalisation. Such urban revitalisation may include the introduction of new industries and services, knowledge-intensive activities, smart city technology, sustainability policies, new events and experiences (Getz & Page, 2016), residential and commercial gentrification, cultural and consumption-led projects, re-imaging work, and more entrepreneurial approaches to urban life (such as through providing commercial hospitality in people's homes) (Richards & Palmer, 2010; Rossi, 2017). There may also be a focus on developing experiences and images for urban areas that are associated with "coolness" and that heighten people's self-concept or identity (Chen & Chou, 2019). Given the potential diversity of such processes, urban regeneration often involves activity in varied policy sectors, such as transport, housing, property development, economic development, retail, leisure, and cultural development, as well as activity directly referred to as regeneration work.

The assessment in this paper considers the tourism policy sector's relations with such other urban regeneration policy sectors in the specific geographical and historical context of two case study old commercial districts in UK cities between 2000 and 2010. These districts had previously experienced a long period of economic decline, physical dereliction and social deprivation, and responses within and across policy sectors were required to turn this around (Carley, Chapman, Hastings, Kirk, & Young, 2000; Carter, 2000; Ling, 2002). The period between 2000 and 2010 in UK cities is an interesting time to examine policy relations for urban regeneration and tourism work as this was soon after policymakers in many of these cities had begun more fully to recognise and exploit tourism's potential for socio-economic development (English Tourist Board, 1980; Law, 1993; Smith, 2012). It was

also a time when some institutions, professionals and other forms of "institutional capital" with a specific focus on tourism were relatively new in many UK urban areas (Law, 2002).

The paper considers whatever types of boundary relations were found to be important in practice for tourism and urban regeneration policy work in the case study districts. Thus, the types of boundary relations which emerged were, for example, economic, administrative, cultural, and discursive. This means that the paper is wide-ranging in its coverage, but this broad coverage and scope assisted with assessing the diverse and often inter-related processes that emerged as important for the case studies. Many of the boundary relations considered here occurred at a local geographical scale, occurring within the two case study urban areas, but they were also interconnected with regional, national and global processes, such as through national policy agendas and global flows of investment. Importantly, while the boundary relations studied here had geographic dimensions, they were fundamentally human and social.

Four analytical themes are identified from literature relevant to boundaries and boundary crossing, and they are then used to assess the tourism policy sector's varied relations with other urban regeneration policy sectors in the case study districts. The analytical themes are: the relative salience, visibility and permeability of boundaries; the significance of discursive boundary relations; power relationships associated with boundary crossing; and the potential for learning within and across boundaries. For the latter analytical theme, particular attention is given to concepts or mechanisms through which learning might occur across boundaries: these being through identification, reflection, coordination and transformation.

2. Boundary relations

2.1. The character of boundaries and boundary crossing

Boundaries in society occur through socio-cultural differences or discontinuities in social interactions and action processes (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). They are "sites of difference" (Abbott, 1995, p. 862) for individuals or social groups because they "separate us from them" in our social relations (Tilly, 2004, p. 211). While societal boundaries reinforce difference, they can also enhance the internal social cohesion and sense of identity within a social network boundary (Mayrl & Quinn, 2016; Quick & Feldman, 2011). Societal boundaries can thus act as "tools by which individuals and groups struggle over and come to agree upon definitions of reality" (Lamont & Molnár, 2002, p. 168). Boundaries are found for all types of societal relations. This paper focuses specifically on boundaries and boundary relations for tourism-related public policies associated with urban regeneration. Mayrl and Quinn (2016, p. 6) suggest that "In mature states, boundaries are constructed through the normal organizational building blocks of administrative hierarchies, financial flows, and symbolic markers". In tourism-related policy work there are varied boundaries, including those between policy sectors, public sector organisations, and the public and private sectors.

Quick and Feldman (2014, p. 674) argue that boundaries should be seen as "porous and tenuous" as they are "junctures that enable diverse connections" across boundaries. Akkerman and Bakker (2011, p. 142) see such boundary crossing as processes through "which previous lines of demarcation between practices are uncertain or destabilized because of feelings of threat or because of increasing similarities or overlap between practices". Quick and Feldman (2014, p. 674; 2011) regard boundary crossing as "the dynamic negotiation of sites of difference", through such practices as reinforcing, bridging, coordinating or integrating across the differences found at boundaries (Zietsma & Lawrence, 2010). These varied relations are dynamic and emergent (Quick & Feldman, 2014).

2.2. Boundary relations and the tourism policy sector

The present study examines boundary relations associated with tourism-related governance between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors. A specific topic related to this is quite widely discussed in the tourism policy literature: whether in practice the varied policies affecting the tourism sector in destinations become integrated and coordinated together. This entails integration of tourism-related policies across different policy sectors, with some of these policy sectors often having only limited actual or perceived tourism involvement. As well as bringing these tourism-related policies together across the policy sectors in destinations (Hogl, Kleinschmit, & Rayner, 2016), it can involve coordinating the associated policy arrangements, policy instruments and implementation activities (Briassoulis, 2004).

The tourism literature indicates that cross-sector integration of tourism-related policies in destinations can offer several potential benefits. Dredge and Jenkins (2007, p. 172, p. 123), for example, suggest that integrated policies affecting tourism could assist to "minimise inconsistencies between the actions and inactions" of governmental and other organisations, and could reduce "ineffective implementation and resource wastage". Wöber (1997, p. 3) asserts that in urban tourism planning "a minimum level of coordination is necessary to avoid inefficient use of scarce resources and ineffective promotions". Other researchers argue that integration between tourism and other policies might help to resolve conflicts over the use of resources or locations for various types of developments (Inskeep, 1994), and to avoid duplication of effort (Longjit & Pearce, 2013).

Yet the integration of tourism-related policies across policy-sector boundaries in destinations can also be fraught with challenges and risks of failure. It is suggested, for example, that difficulties can occur when mobilising actors around unified policies in partnerships associated with tourism development (Bramwell & Lane, 2000). Tourism-related policies may be particularly difficult to integrate because the industry is fragmented and because relevant policies span diverse policy sectors and actors (Bramwell & Pomfret, 2007; Edwards, Griffin, & Hayllar, 2008; Manente et al., 2013; Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2016). The diversity of organisations and businesses involved in urban tourism led Wöber (1997, p. 3) to argue that this policy arena suffers from "a danger of over-fragmentation of the development and marketing effort". Cheong and Miller (2000) also assert that tourism's fragmentation, and the subordinate status of some tourism policies relative to other policies, potentially can weaken the representation of tourism stakeholders in policy-making. The potential obstacles to effective integrated working for all policy sectors led Hogl et al. (2016, p. 411) to assert that "the desirability of policy integration becomes an empirical question and cannot be set a priori".

A number of studies focus on policy and policymaking integration between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors in destinations. Aall, Dodds, Sælensminde, and Brendehaug (2015), for example, assess integration of Norway's tourism policies and its environmental policies. They consider whether tourism policy documents included the environment as a central issue (called inclusion), if there was shared cross-sectoral understanding of the environment as an issue (termed consistency), the relative priority given to the environment in tourism policies (labelled weighting), and the degree of evaluation of sustainable tourism (called reporting). Similarly, Longjit and Pearce (2013, p. 174) evaluate the degree of integration of several policy-making organisations, policies and related practices that were associated to varying degrees with tourism at Pattaya resort in Thailand. They conclude that the organisations in Pattaya "are not directing their efforts towards destination goals and there is no strategic approach linking them".

More studies examine how destination tourism agencies increasingly work across policy boundaries to widen participation in policy work, notably through public-private sector partnerships and civic engagement (Adu-Ampong, 2017; Bramwell, 2010 & 2015). This reflects a

trend in the roles of the state in some countries following neo-liberal public sector reforms begun in the 1980s and 1990s (Bevir, 2009; Dredge & Jenkins, 2007). These reforms are said to have led to a shift in policymaking from hierarchical bureaucracies based on the state – labelled as an emphasis on government – toward networks and markets beyond the state, through what can be termed "the new governance" (Bevir, 2009; Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Dredge & Jamal, 2015). Relatively few studies in the tourism field, however, focus on whether this trend in policymaking toward engaging more diverse actors alongside state institutions – one form of wider cross-boundary working - has been accompanied by greater cross-sector working between tourism and other policy sectors, the subject focus of the present paper.

Studies of Destination Management Organisations (DMOs) in co-ordinating the activities of tourism-related organisations and businesses across the public, private and third sectors are particularly relevant for the present assessment (Volgger & Pechlaner, 2014). These studies suggest that in the past many DMOs may have focused more on marketing issues. Two evaluations from the 1990s suggest that the DMOs studied – often visitor and convention bureaux – tended not to undertake extensive product development and planning functions (Bramwell & Rawding, 1994; Getz, Anderson, & Sheehan, 1998). More recently, Sheehan, Vargas-Sánchez, Presenza, and Abbate (2016, p. 549) assert that "over time, the acronym DMO has evolved from a meaning centred on marketing (i.e. Destination Marketing Organization) to a meaning centred on management (i.e. Destination Management Organization)".

Blackman, Kennedy, and Ritchie (2011) provide a rare explicit use of boundary-crossing concepts from social science debates when examining governance relationships associated with DMOs. More specifically, they examine the "potential role of DMOs in managing knowledge across boundaries during crises" (p. 337). Drawing on Carlile's (2002; 2004) ideas about managing knowledge across boundaries – one form of boundary-crossing – they contend that DMOs "should play an important role as knowledge spanners/brokers to transfer, translate and transform knowledge to stakeholders" (p. 337) across diverse groups and domains.

2.3. Boundary relations for tourism and other urban regeneration policy sectors

The paper's case study explores boundary relations for tourism and other policy sectors engaged in urban regeneration work. These particular boundary relations have only occasionally been researched in depth, although many studies do discuss processes whereby the tourism sector can support urban regeneration (Wise, 2016). It is suggested that tourism can encourage such revitalisation through, for example, new business formation, enhanced place images, improved cultural vibrancy, event and public space animation, commercial gentrification, and through it providing additional justification for investment in "flagship" projects (Richards & Palmer, 2010; Smith, 2012).

A few studies begin to touch on boundary relations associated with tourism and urban regeneration, and are also relevant to the present case study period (2000–2010). An examination of urban tourism in the UK up to the early 1990s by Law (1993, p. 144), for instance, notes that there could be difficulties around local government departmental boundaries since "in practice departments may be jealous of their independence and may have different policies and priorities". It asserts that at that time when a tourism section existed it was usually concerned with promotion and marketing, and not development and planning, and also that "its ability to influence may be affected by where this small section is located within a bigger department, and whether there are formal structures for coordination". In another study, Stevenson (2013) argues that tourism was only a marginal consideration in planning in the UK for East London's regeneration associated with the 2012 London Olympic Games. The tourism policies behind that planning were developed in quite opportunistic ways, largely outside of the formal strategic planning process, and mainly at a late stage of

Olympic Games planning.

2.4. Themes for the analysis of boundary relations

Four analytical themes associated with boundary relations are used in the paper's examination of tourism and urban regeneration policy work.

The first analytical theme used in the case study concerns the varying salience, visibility and permeability of boundaries, and notably the extent to which there was recognition of potentially valuable features and common interests across the boundaries (Lamont & Molnár, 2002). Boundary crossing may gain salience and visibility, for example, through a reduction in differing social relations or representations on either side of the boundary, with overlapping or shared cross-boundary features becoming increasingly influential (Tilly, 2004). This trend can often result from recognition of potentially valuable features and common interests across boundaries, and that can lead to enhanced cross-boundary cooperation and overlapping features. In the specific context of policy work, Mayrl and Quinn (2016, pp. 2–3) assert that the "normal processes of making and implementing policy pose near-continual opportunities for the inscription, erasure, or re-inscription of the existing boundaries of states".

The second analytical theme applied to the case study concerns the distinction between social boundaries and discursive boundaries. The assessment considers social boundaries to be "objectified forms of social differences" that are seen in patterns of social relations (Gieryn, 1983; Lamont & Molnar, 2002, p. 168; Gieryn, 1983; Pachucki, Pendergrass, & Lamont, 2007). For example, policy activities undertaken by the tourism sector may differ from those undertaken by the culture sector in response to the same policy issue. By contrast, discursive boundaries are taken to be distinctions between different perceptions, meanings, beliefs and preferences which are expressed or communicated about a social entity. Such discursive boundaries are viewed as equally real as social boundaries, due to them often serving "to enforce, maintain, normalize, or rationalize social boundaries", as well as "to contest and reframe the meaning of social boundaries" (Lamont & Molnár, 2002, p. 186). Discourses provide people with systems of meaning and ways of thinking, and thus potentially they may help to shape people's subjectivities and also behaviour, although people actively negotiate this relationship (Fairclough, 2013; Inglis & Thorpe, 2019; Peet & Watts, 1996).

The interpretation of discourses outlined here is based on the ideas of Antonio Gramsci (1971), who argued that everyone has the capacity for thought and also to engage in meaningful activities, actions that need not just reproduce society in the way it is, but can also change it (Inglis & Thorpe, 2019). Gramsci saw human life as involving clashes of contesting views of the world, of differing discourses and understandings of what society is and should be. Any hegemony of ideas is seen as potentially fragile as individuals have the potential to negotiate in their own thinking and discourses beyond the views of dominant groups (Avdikos, 2011). The study thus considers both social boundaries and discursive boundaries.

The third analytical theme used here concerns power relations associated with boundaries. It is argued here that policy sector boundaries are affected by the interests and interactions between differing individuals and social groups. These interests and interactions involve differential power relations, perhaps affected by actors having unequal competencies and skills, political power and also socio-economic returns or rewards (Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Su, Bramwell, & Whalley, 2018). Zietsma and Lawrence (2010, p. 193), for example, assert that "Boundaries and practices have material effects on the distribution of power and privilege, which can fuel conflicts both within and across boundaries". The present paper assesses the power relations, including asymmetries or inequalities, across the boundaries between the tourism sector and other policy sectors involved in urban regeneration. Power relations across policy sectors can be manifested in many ways,

including in how public sector managers "problematize" and delimit issue definitions and responsibilities between the respective policy sectors. The practices that constitute something as an object of analysis and action can affect, for example, what issues are on the table and which of them are prioritised, which in turn can lead to some policy sectors gaining prominence and influence (or power) over others (Quick & Feldman, 2011).

The fourth and last analytical theme used in the paper's case study concerns the potential for learning within boundaries or when boundaries are crossed. Learning is important as it can, for instance, enhance the likelihood that societal objectives are achieved (Quick & Feldman, 2014). The paper considers the extent to which within-boundary and cross-boundary working enabled tourism to assist with urban regeneration. In particular, it examines whether actors in different urban regeneration policy sectors recognised, reflected on, and acted on tourism's potentially valuable features and also their common interests with the tourism policy sector. Such learning may have encouraged a more beneficial use of tourism for regeneration.

In relation to this last analytical theme, the case study assessment uses Akkerman and Bakker's (2011) categorisation of concepts or mechanisms behind learning at the boundary. The first of these learning mechanisms is "identification", which concerns actors recognising and learning across boundaries between differing practices, such as between tourism and urban regeneration. This identification may involve, for example, actors noting and defining practices across a boundary in terms of how they are either different or similar to practices within the boundary.

Another cross-boundary learning mechanism, that of "reflection", concerns actors coming "to realize and explicate differences between practices" around a boundary, and then starting to "learn something new about their own and others' practices" (pp. 144–145). This boundary relation can entail "perspective making", or making explicit one's own understanding and knowledge of a particular issue, and "perspective taking", or "taking of the other [across the boundary] into account, in light of a reflexive knowledge of one's own perspective" (p. 145). Reflection differs from identification as it concerns not only a renewed sense of practices and a reconstruction of current identity, but also the actor formulating distinctive perspectives and possibly beginning to see things in a different light. This type of working across boundaries can enrich one's identity beyond its current status, and that new construction of identity may inform future practices.

Akkerman and Bakker (2011) identify "coordination" as a further cross-boundary learning mechanism. This concerns actors "creating cooperative and routinized exchanges between practices" (p. 150) across a boundary, which can allow "diverse practices to cooperate efficiently…even in the absence of consensus" (p. 143). Coordination between actors' different practices or perspectives on either side of a boundary can be encouraged through improved communication, efforts at translation of ideas between different world views, and through coordination procedures becoming routinized in regular operational activities or procedures.

A final mechanism of cross-boundary learning, of "transformation", concerns learning among actors that "leads to profound changes in practices", such as through collaboration and the co-development of new practices across boundaries (p. 146). Transformation can result from encountering discontinuities across a boundary that lead to confrontation or to the recognition of a shared problem space. The discontinuity in the intersecting worlds around the boundary can encourage actors to reconsider and transform their current practices. This transformation might involve hybridisation, with ingredients from the different contexts being combined in something new.

3. Case study and methodology

Boundaries and cross-boundary relations between the tourism policy sector and other urban regeneration policy sectors are explored

next for two case study old commercial districts in large UK cities: The Quays in Greater Manchester in North-West England, and NewcastleGateshead Quayside in North-East England.

The boundary relations are considered for regeneration and tourism work between 2000 and 2010, soon after the time when many UK cities began more fully to recognise and use tourism's potential for urban renewal (English Tourist Board, 1980; Law, 2002; Rossi & Vanolo, 2012; Smith, 2012). In a discussion of tourism in UK cities, Law (1993, p. 1) argues that "The 1980s witnessed a significant shift in attitude by cities towards the tourist industry", being a time when "more and more cities saw the tourist industry as one which should be encouraged". While the present paper focuses on the 2000–2010 period, information was also collected for the 1980s to 1999 when relevant to understanding that later period. Thus, the assessment covers a time when substantial boundary crossing between the tourism and other urban regeneration policy sectors still may have been relatively new. There was also a growing emphasis over these years on network-based governance rather than on government, such as through partnerships and joint working. That involved more work across stakeholder groups, and potentially it might also have encouraged work across the tourism and urban regeneration sectors.

The two case study districts were selected as they share several characteristics, facilitating comparisons. Both are on waterfronts formerly important for the transhipment of goods: The Quays on the Manchester Ship Canal and NewcastleGateshead Quayside on the River Tyne (O'Brien, 1997; Salford City Council, 2008). When transhipment activity declined both areas experienced falling property values, physical dereliction, employment loses and social deprivation. Regeneration had also occurred in both districts just prior to, and during, the study period, which included a revalorisation of property values and also significant tourism-related features (Miles, 2005; Struthers, 2003). Both districts had seen major investments in "flagship" cultural facilities, and the waterfronts of both districts have become attractive backdrops for commercial development and tourism. Yet the two districts also differed: tourism in NewcastleGateshead Quayside, for example, benefiting from being located closer than The Quays to city centre retailing, entertainment and public transport hubs.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 22 respondents in each of the two districts who were engaged in, or interested in, relevant policy processes. There were 24 interviewees, mostly at senior level, in public sector-oriented organisations, 8 in the private sector, and 7 in third-sector organisations (including theatres, museums and galleries). Among the public sector-oriented staff, 13 were in local government, 4 in DMOs, 4 in urban regeneration agencies, and 3 in Regional Development Agencies. In the private sector, 5 were in property development, 2 in hospitality/leisure businesses, and 1 from a Business Improvement District. The interview questions examined how and to what extent actors were involved in tourism-related regeneration, and the character of that engagement. Other sources used included policy and planning documents.

The assessment here of boundary relations between the tourism and other related urban regeneration policy sectors for the two districts adopts a realist perspective, with a focus on critical explanation of social relations and processes, and that is combined with a hermeneutic emphasis on the importance of discourses for social relations (Harding & Blokland, 2014). The continual and evolving dialogue between collected information, analytical themes and conceptual ideas involved a process of "selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and/or transforming" information in order to develop conceptual interpretations (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). New interpretations emerged through the re-reading and critical interrogation of the interviews. The researchers sought to confirm and also disconfirm ideas and to remain open to new interpretations (Mellon & Bramwell, 2018).

The research topic was examined for the case study districts using the four analytical themes from literature relevant to boundaries and boundary crossing, as identified earlier in Section 2.4. These are: the

relative salience, visibility and permeability of boundaries, notably the extent to which there was recognition of potentially valuable features and also common interests across the boundaries; the significance of discursive boundaries; power relationships associated with boundaries; and the potential for learning within and across boundaries.

The last of these analytical themes – the potential for learning within and across boundaries – is used to organise the study's results sections. These follow the concepts or mechanisms of learning within and across boundaries established by Akkerman and Bakker (2011), and explained in Section 2.4: identification, reflection, coordination and transformation. Thus, the initial results section examines learning between the tourism and regeneration policy sectors through identification and reflection mechanisms, which are combined here as they are more meaning-based processes. The final results section then considers coordination and transformation learning across the policy boundaries between tourism and regeneration, with these combined as they are more practice-based learning processes.

4. Identification and reflection across boundaries

Analysis now considers Akkerman and Bakker's (2011) learning concepts or mechanisms of identification and reflection across boundaries. Here it was found for the two case studies that there was identification and reflection among actors in other regeneration policy sectors about tourism's potential supporting roles across the boundaries, but with significant limits and constraints.

4.1. Increasing identification and reflection over time on tourism's role

Tourism gained more salience and visibility (the study's first analytical theme for the study of boundaries) as a policy sector as the two districts benefitted from earlier regeneration activities, often initiated before the 2000–2010 study period, and also from the opening of major new cultural facilities. As a consequence, tourism's policy boundaries were becoming more permeable and there was more potential for associated reflection and cross-sector learning.

A former Salford regeneration officer, for example, explained that The Quays in its early regeneration stages "was just very derelict, polluted…nobody wanted to go there, nobody wanted to invest there, there were no people employed there". Land reclamation and site preparation for development was an especially common issue in the early regeneration agendas from the 1970s. When discussing the role of tourism in the early stages of urban renewal in NewcastleGateshead Quayside, a senior local politician for Newcastle asked: "does the regeneration bring tourism, or tourism prompt the regeneration? In Newcastle it is quite clear that regeneration came first…[as before the] buildings were all run down and didn't look good". It was noted by a culture manager in NewcastleGateshead Quayside that tourism tended to follow after earlier regeneration activities had been finished. He recounted how: "as we invested more in regeneration we got a higher profile. So more people got to know about it and came to stay. I don't think it started with tourists, but it became kind of a very useful cycle of investment, visitors, investment, visitors". In The Quays context, a property professional also noted that tourism and tourism policy gained more prominence at later stages of the district's regeneration, albeit they still were not central concerns:

"The role of tourism is not, in my view, core to what is going on at The Quays, but it has been an important peripheral cue. I don't think The Quays' original idea and plans set out to be a tourist destination. That way the original plan has changed and that has been realised over the last 10–15 years, and tourism has become an increasing part of it. I don't think it set out to be tourism-led, but its role has become more important, but still not central to what is going on. I think central to what is going on here is still creating employment and creating somewhere for people to live".

Tourism gained more salience and visibility in both districts after several major flagship cultural facilities were opened soon after 2000 (the start of the paper's study period). They were The Lowry arts complex (opened in 2000) and the Imperial War Museum North (opened in 2002) in The Quays, and the Baltic Centre for Contemporary Art (opened 2002) and the SAGE Gateshead concert and music education centre (opened in 2004) in NewcastleGateshead Quayside.

A factor in tourism's growing prominence as a policy sector was that in the early regeneration stages commercial developers often had not considered tourism to be a highly profitable investment. But once the districts were firmly established as worth visiting, there had been more identification of, and reflection and associated learning about, tourism as an investment opportunity. That stage followed after environmental and infrastructure improvements and the development of major cultural facilities. A property consultant involved in NewcastleGateshead Quayside explained how:

"A hotel development in a mixed-use regeneration development does not lead. A hotel prefers to come at the end of the programme. It likes to follow, by which time there is a lot more business, a lot more residents, so the local economy is more strongly established and they therefore have a stronger market…Without the demand, tourism development is very fragile and extremely high risk".

4.2. Identification and reflection, and the discursive boundaries associated with tourism and other policy sectors

The study's second analytical theme concerns the potential significance of discursive boundaries. Here a prominent discursive narrative evident both in respondents' comments and local policy documents was that the "culture" sector had played a leading role in the regeneration of the two districts, notably through public investment in the previously mentioned flagship cultural facilities. Investments in these "flagship" cultural projects in iconic buildings were seen as an integrative driver for regeneration, with benefits which crossed policy-sector boundaries. A local government officer argued that the public sector's lead in developing the Baltic and Sage Gateshead in NewcastleGateshead Quayside had symbolic significance and had encouraged subsequent private-sector investment across sectoral boundaries in a hotel and offices. She asserted that "None of those would have happened if we [local government] hadn't changed the perception of [NewcastleGateshead] Quayside". A developer in The Quays argued that:

"To have a building that is iconic in its nature and unusual provides more diverse land uses, and it helps create value in the land you still have [which is] seeking development. It attracts interest in the area; it raises the profile of the area; it raises people's aspirations, and the way they look at the area".

The priority given to "culture" in local discourses seems to have encouraged regeneration thinking and also learning which crossed several policy-sector boundaries, including indirectly across the boundaries to tourism, and which tended to make the boundaries more permeable. A local government tourism manager stated that culture-led regeneration stimulated broad, cross-policy sector effects, including investment and

"all of the spin-offs and benefits that culture brings, …coming up with iconic buildings or structures, raising the profile, …events and activities, making people feel better about the area that they live in and they want to live in, …it brings visitors".

Another prominent discourse in both districts was that tourism had a useful but only secondary, complementary role in support of the primary goal of urban regeneration. It was suggested that tourism was one means – albeit just one of several – to achieve urban regeneration's primary objectives, such as economic prosperity, physical regeneration,

and improved quality of life for local people (Salford City Council, 2004 & 2008). A representative of a major developer in The Quays argued that tourism's role was "purely complementary. It complements in particular what we do here. It creates environments where developments are more attractive".

Tourism's supporting role became more salient and permeable across policy sector boundaries through the discursive narrative of "mixed-use" development. Various synergies were identified here across the boundaries of mixed socio-economic activities in urban regeneration, such as across combinations of office, residential, retail, culture and tourism activities. The mixed-use development discourse encouraged boundary crossing in the social practices of regeneration, through the emphasis on integration across policy sectors and on changes that were more than the sum of the individual policy-sector parts.

Boundary crossing between tourism and other activities could be seen to help animate urban places, benefit other economic activities, and make for attractive living and working environments. For example, a Newcastle property consultant suggested that tourism and leisure activity helped to change people's perceptions of the district "from a derelict and run-down area to one with vibrancy and vitality, creating an area where people can live, work and play. It attracts and brings people, brings money into the local economy". The policies in local planning documents – which were both discursive and practical frameworks – also addressed tourism's cross-boundary synergies, as shown in planning guidance for MediaCityUK, a mixed-use development focused around large television studios in The Quays. This guidance stated that "Providing a blend of commercial offices, other employment/visitor attractions, retail, leisure and residential uses throughout the area will help to create an urban environment that can accommodate 24-hour activity and thus promote the vibrant environment conducive to creative industries" (Salford City Council & Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council, 2007, p. 13). Tourism, culture and leisure also often appeared together as inter-linked activities in the local policy documents and in the interviewees' responses. Such discourses of boundary crossing between tourism and other activities appear to have had real consequences for actors' actions in city regeneration work (Fairclough, 2013; Gramsci, 1971; Inglis & Thorpe, 2019).

These important local discursive narratives – the priority given to "culture", the secondary, complementary role attributed to tourism, and an emphasis on "mixed use" developments – may have assisted indirectly with the integration of tourism across varied policy boundaries with other urban regeneration activities. But they might also have reduced tourism's salience and visibility (the study's first analytical theme for the study of boundaries), and therefore the extent to which tourism's roles were directly identified and reflected upon by the various urban regeneration agencies. They may also have discouraged clear recognition and learning that different agencies and policy sectors were already involved in tourism, and that value potentially might have been created through more active boundary crossing with tourism. Thus, the permeability across policy sector boundaries arising from these discourses potentially could both encourage and discourage the tourism sector's visibility and tourism actors' involvement in the urban regeneration policy arena. These issues affected the relative influence or power of the tourism policy sector compared to other policy sectors involved in urban regeneration (the study's third analytical theme).

4.3. Salience, visibility and permeability of tourism thinking encouraged by new partnership-based tourism agencies

The study's first analytical theme concerns the salience, visibility and permeability of tourism thinking in other urban regeneration policy sectors. Recognition among actors in other city regeneration policy sectors of the salience of tourism as an economic activity and policy sector was encouraged through the establishment of new partnership-based tourism agencies (DMOs) in both case study districts. The setting

up of these new agencies reflected a trend in urban governance from the 1980s and 1990s in which more diverse actors started to engage in policymaking alongside government (Bevir, 2009; Dredge & Jamal, 2015). This was also a period soon after many cities had started to pay more attention to tourism as part of their effort to attract capital by projecting "an image of offering innovative, exciting, and creative lifestyles and living environments" (Britton, 1991, p. 470; Rossi, 2017). These new tourism agencies established in the 1980s and 1990s provided new "institutional capital" (Nunkoo, 2017) for an enhanced policy focus on tourism. This, therefore, relates to the study's third analytical theme: the power relations associated with different policy sectors.

A public-private sector partnership-based tourism agency (DMO) was established earlier in Greater Manchester than in Newcastle and Gateshead. For the former, the public-private sector Greater Manchester Visitor and Convention Bureau was established in 1991 from a Tourism and Leisure Association that had been set up in 1986 (Law, 1996). In 1996 a broad place marketing agency – Marketing Manchester – was formed, incorporating a similar public-private sector Visitor and Convention Bureau. Then Visit Manchester was created in 2008 as a separate division within Marketing Manchester, and this became responsible for visitor destination management and marketing activities. The two public-private sector partnership DMOs in Newcastle and Gateshead were established later. The NewcastleGateshead Initiative was formed in 2000 as the destination marketing organisation for Newcastle and Gateshead, and Tourism Tyne and Wear was established in 2007 as an Area Tourism Partnership for the larger Tyne and Wear region.

These new tourism partnership organisations were likely to have raised awareness of tourism (and of its potential support for urban regeneration) among actors in differing policy sectors in both districts through their publication of tourism strategies. Visit Manchester, for example, had profiled tourism through its tourism strategies for Greater Manchester, including destination management action plans. These had highlighted tourism's importance and the sector's requirements to successfully underpin socio-economic development (e.g. Visit Manchester, 2008).

Cross-sector identification and reflection was also encouraged by the new Regional Development Agencies, which were established in 1998 with broad remits to contribute to regional "economic development, social and physical regeneration, business support, skills and employment, and…sustainable development" (Pearce & Ayres, 2009, p. 539), including through tourism (Coles, Dinan, & Hutchison, 2014). An official from Tourism Tyne and Wear explained how this organisation identified priority tourism development projects in its own plans (e.g. Tourism Tyne and Wear, 2009), and it advised its Regional Development Agency, One North East, about their potential and importance.

Yet, the new DMOs had only a limited influence on other urban regeneration-related actors, including on their identification and reflective learning about tourism and their own links with tourism. This was because, despite being supported by the Regional Development Agencies and local government organisations, they were outside more general economic development organisations and they lacked the political or financial power regularly and directly to exert influence on the urban regeneration policy agenda. Another reason was that the DMOs had a much stronger focus on marketing than on development-related activities, as examined more fully later. The local influence of Visit Manchester and Tourism Tyne and Wear in the case study districts could also be somewhat diluted because of their geographically wider responsibilities – the former for the Greater Manchester city region and the latter for the extensive Tyne and Wear region.

Thus, professionals in the DMOs could find it difficult to encourage actors from across the policy-sector boundaries to include tourism in their own policy priorities and to work more cooperatively with the tourism sector. A DMO officer for the NewcastleGateshead Quayside area claimed that:

"I think it is very difficult to keep and infiltrate other policy agendas with tourism…What we need to be doing is making sure that tourism impacts on planning agendas and economic development agendas, and that people that are forming those policies and strategies are thinking about the visitor and visitor experience. Not only with local authorities, but the same with developers. When they are developing buildings, working with local authorities to develop whatever that might be, that kind of commitment to visitors should always be there. [But] that is hard."

Overall, in terms of Akkerman and Bakker's (2011) learning concepts or mechanisms of identification and reflection across boundaries, there was evidence of awareness and learning about tourism's role in wider urban regeneration policy agendas. But there were also significant constraints on the tourism policy sector's influence on other policy agendas. This meant that cross-boundary learning could be restricted and that actors in the urban regeneration policy sectors at times did not reflect regularly and in depth on tourism's growing salience in the two districts, including for the wider urban regeneration agenda.

5. Coordination and transformation across boundaries

Coordination and transformation are further learning concepts or mechanisms across boundaries identified by Akkerman and Bakker (2011), and they are potential outcomes of the other mechanisms of identification and reflection. It was found in the case study areas that there had been coordination and possibly some transformation across the boundaries between the tourism and urban regeneration policy sectors, but again this was within significant limits and constraints.

5.1. Some learning and coordination across boundaries, often through the activities of new partnership-based agencies and individual actors

Despite several limitations (as will be discussed), there were instances of increased learning and coordination across the boundaries between the tourism and other urban regeneration policy sectors. This was encouraged by the activities of the Regional Development Agencies and the new partnership-based DMOs, and also of a few individual actors who had gained experience in tourism-related renewal projects. Consideration of the relative political influence or power of these agencies and actors aligns with study's third analytical theme: the power relations associated with boundaries.

The involvement of Regional Development Agencies in the case study districts had encouraged some increased visibility and dissemination of tourism thinking, as well as some coordination between tourism and regeneration work. The work of these regional-scale organisations reflected a growing emphasis in UK governance on bringing together the public, private and third sectors in socio-economic development activities (Coles et al., 2014; Pearce & Ayres, 2009). They brought together regional-scale policies and funding for economic development and also tourism, the latter achieved by taking over the work of former regional tourist boards. Among many other priorities, they advocated the importance of tourism for economic development, including for urban revitalisation, and argued that local tourism and economic development should be integrated and coordinated. For example, the Regional Development Agency responsible for North-East England, which included NewcastleGateshead Quayside, argued in its regional tourism strategy for 2005 to 2010 that "tourism is a vital component of urban regeneration strategies", as long as there is "careful planning in terms of location, quality and integration with other services, and provided decisions are based on sound market research" (One North East, 2005, p. 25).

However, while the Regional Development Agencies sought to bring tourism together with development, often their focus in tourism was on the broad strategic level and on regional-scale destination management and marketing. This meant that in practice at times they had only a limited direct influence on developers or public sector agencies at the local level. A culture sector senior manager argued that "He [a Regional Development Agency senior tourism manager] has been trying to influence the product side as much as he could, but I think those conversations, and the joining up of that, doesn't happen as much as it should".

The Regional Development Agencies also encouraged the DMOs in both districts to integrate tourism marketing work with both tourism and general economic development activity. Thus, a Regional Development Agency senior tourism officer asserted that: "I'm absolutely convinced with the idea that a tourism organisation has to be a full service organisation…marketing and product development absolutely has to be hand-in-hand". At times the DMOs in the two districts extended their work beyond tourism marketing to also engage in tourism-related development and regeneration activities, thereby learning more about development issues. Both the NewcastleGateshead Initiative and Visit Manchester DMOs, for example, at times improved visitor services, secured some environmental improvements, gave advice on major development proposals, and introduced cultural programmes and events.

There were also some occasions when senior DMO managers were involved in high-level, strategic decisions about major tourism-related investments, increasing their power and also encouraging cross-sector learning and possibly transformation. Some senior tourism managers of the Northwest Regional Development Agency and Visit Manchester led a visitor economy partnership within the MediacityUK development for "managing the whole site as a visitor offer, developing appropriate branding and contexts and facilities for visitors" (a Regional Development Agency senior tourism manager). A senior manager for the NewcastleGateshead Initiative DMO contrasted such high-level engagement with the limited involvement of local government tourism staff:

> "This afternoon I am meeting a hotel developer, who probably has got £40 million to spend in the city. There has not been a [local government] tourism officer anywhere near that discussion. It is a discussion with property, economic development and regeneration, and ourselves as people who know the tourism market".

In such ways, the DMOs could also assist in promoting development projects to potential investors and work to encourage learning about tourism across local government and among city leaders. Yet the DMOs' involvement in tourism development was still limited as they tended to lack the political power and financial influence needed greatly to increase tourism awareness and learning across local government agendas. A DMO officer claimed, for example, that

> "the NewcastleGateshead Initiative does really a great job of ensuring that tourism and the profile of the city is reasonably high, especially in the politicians' minds. It is reasonably high on most people's agendas, but it is that cross-cutting, cross local authority departments where politicians wouldn't necessarily make the connections and officers certainly wouldn't at this stage".

A few key regeneration policy actors also helped to promote learning about tourism, to increase its coordination, and to encourage transformation across the boundaries between the tourism and urban regeneration policy sectors. These actors appeared to have reflected on tourism in some depth through their previous involvement in tourism projects. A respondent described how the Chairman of a leading related regeneration development company in The Quays understood "the power of the visitor economy far better than many people either in government or local authorities. He understands that sports, culture, shopping, beautiful places, beautiful environment are all part of the destination experience". Others were also starting to learn about tourism's previously less recognised potential importance for developments in the two districts. Thus, a chartered surveyor, who worked on various types of development, explained how his involvement in tourism-

related projects helped him to consider tourism and visitors more in his work. He stated:

"Recently, particularly with the conference centre, I feel as if I am more [involved in tourism] now than I ever was. In my earlier days, when I worked with commercial developments, pure industrial and office-based commercial developments, I didn't feel that at all. I think the more I got involved in retail, the more this idea developed around [avoiding]…'clone town' environments and to try to get a point of difference. And in that sense you do begin to feel like a tourist generator".

In such ways, some actors involved in tourism-related projects were recognising the potential importance of boundary crossing for learning, and for Akkerman and Bakker's (2011) coordination and possibly also transformation learning mechanisms between the tourism and urban regeneration policy sectors. Yet such activities tended to occur more at an individual level or on an ad hoc basis, rather than through regular and routine practices at all levels of policy work.

5.2. Limited coordination across boundaries due to administrative and organisational barriers

Just as there were limits to identification and reflection on tourism's role for regeneration policies, there were also limits and constraints for the other learning mechanisms highlighted by Akkerman and Bakker (2011), of coordination and transformation across relevant policy boundaries. These constraints affected the salience and visibility of the tourism policy sector, and the political power of this sector relative to other urban regeneration policy sectors (the study's first and third analytical themes).

There were a number of administrative and organisational barriers to coordination and transformation across the policy boundaries between the tourism and other regeneration policy sectors in the case study districts. According to an officer in the Tourism Tyne and Wear DMO, tourism's coordination across local government boundaries required cross-cutting working between local authority departments, yet in practice such coordination was restricted due to administrative barriers. The officer explained that:

"The principle was that we [the DMO] go into the [local government] tourism team, and then they disperse that [tourism] information through the local authority. In reality, that doesn't really happen a) because tourism is not very high on people's agendas, and b) because tourism in terms of management is usually quite low down, so they don't have the clout or ability to be able to influence other agendas".

Tourism's cross-boundary coordination and transformation for urban regeneration in local government could also be hampered for other reasons. One was that decisions about major tourism-related regeneration schemes were usually led by public-sector officials and politicians who were very senior and influential and had broad policy remits, while public-sector tourism officials were often lower-level, less powerful, and had more specific policy remits. This meant that local government tourism staff were "not necessarily hooked into some of the higher-level development things going on" (senior manager, NewcastleGateshead Initiative DMO), and also that they did not always have regular and routine channels to promote tourism thinking to politicians and other regeneration professionals in local government. The coordination that took place could also depend on the varying personal views and understanding about tourism of a few key senior policy actors.

Coordination across policy sectors in local government could also be constrained by some local authorities not having formal tourism strategies. For instance, a Salford City Council respondent expressed disappointment that "What we haven't got in Salford is a tourism strategy. There is no body responsible for leading the development of tourism

strategy for Salford". The result was believed to be that there was no "framework that the Council and others [had] agreed to for tourism that holds it all together". Such limits on tourism's coordination with other policy sectors were also affected by tourism having a lower policy priority as it was not a statutory responsibility or duty required to be undertaken by local government according to legislation.

Another issue was that in both districts the coordination of tourism marketing across boundaries with tourism development (intra-sectoral integration) (Mullally & Dunphy, 2015) was hampered by institutional arrangements creating perceptual and actual boundaries between these two functions. This was because the partnership-based DMOs were largely responsible for tourism marketing, whereas local government largely concentrated on tourism-related infrastructure and tourism product development activities. While the DMOs' marketing activities raised the profile of tourism and attracted tourists, which assisted in economic development and urban revitalisation, they often had only a limited direct involvement in tourism-related development projects. A local government regeneration officer stated: "They [the DMOs] are working with what is already there. They have product that they are selling. We [local government] are the people who create the product". A senior manager for Visit Manchester similarly claimed that "we tend to get involved once the attractions are built, in terms of promoting them".

5.3. Limited coordination across boundaries due to rapid decision-making

MediaCityUK in The Quays was an urban regeneration project with tourism elements that was secured through rapid decisions among a small group of very senior actors, but without tourism specialists. The project involved relocating to The Quays several of the British Broadcasting Corporation's (BBC) TV recording and broadcasting activities, with some of the activities attracting studio and concert audiences. The project also came to include retail, leisure and hotel facilities, and a public space for events. A member of the scheme's small negotiating team recalled how they had authority to make key project decisions. The team could quickly and directly contact the Chairman of the company owning the development site (Peel Holdings) and Salford City Council's Leader to check about issues:

"we were a very small team negotiating with the BBC; we were very, very 'can do'…Director A from Peel Holdings would say 'do it', or pick up the phone to his Chairman personally and say 'we need to do this, will you wear it?'. And the answer will be 'do it'. Similarly, we had a hot line to the Leader of the Council on the other side as well. That enabled us to move very, very quickly".

Reflecting on MediaCityUK, a culture sector senior manager observed how opportunistic urban regeneration projects could be. He stated that "it ultimately comes down to who has got the money with a reasonable idea at the right moment. It is like throwing things in the air…you have to grasp very big opportunities on a very big scale very quickly". Major development opportunities such as this, therefore, could require quick decision-making and that might reduce the scope for consultation. In such cases the decisions can often be made by very senior public- and private-sector actors, and the DMOs and public-sector tourism managers are less likely to be involved. The rapid responses for such projects thus could restrict learning and coordination about tourism issues and also the tourism sector's political influence on urban regeneration policy (associated with the study's third analytical theme of power relations around boundaries).

However, while tourism policy sector actors were not involved in the initial planning for the MediaCityUK flagship development, a visitor economy partnership was established soon after the scheme started, which had a vision to develop it and The Quays as a whole as an international visitor destination. The partnership involved the Northwest Regional Development Agency, Visit Manchester, Central Salford urban regeneration company, the developer, the local authorities and major

local visitor attractions. Thus, this initiative appeared to have led to an early involvement by local tourism actors in policy work for a major regeneration project, which potentially accords with Akkerman and Baker's (2011) transformative mechanism for learning across a boundary. A DMO senior manager observed that MediaCityUK was:

"the first time we are involved at such an early stage…Because it is a hugely important development… [and] visitor attractions will probably depend on the project, we did get involved in the regeneration aspect of it fairly early…[The partnership's] role is very much lobbying…for visitor experiences and [to] ensure that we get it right in [an] early stage".

There was no equivalent partnership in NewcastleGateshead Quayside.

Overall, in relation to Akkerman and Bakker's (2011) coordination and transformation concepts or mechanisms for cross-boundary learning, there was evidence of coordination and possibly transformation across the boundaries between the tourism and urban regeneration policy sectors, but this was within significant limits and constraints. Coordination and associated learning across these boundaries, for example, could be quite ad hoc and could also depend on the varying personal views and understanding about tourism of a few, often senior, individual policy actors. Much more comprehensive transformation as a result of that coordination generally was likely to be modest.

6. Discussion and conclusions

The paper has assessed relations between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors involved in urban regeneration in two old commercial urban districts in the UK from 2000 to 2010. This was an interesting period for a study of these relations because many UK cities had only quite recently begun more fully to recognise and use tourism within urban regeneration policy work, and there was also evidence of an increasing shift from government-led toward "new governance" forms of policymaking. The evaluation of this policy sector cross-boundary working in the case study districts employed analytical themes and concepts drawn from literature relevant to assessing varied types of societal boundaries and boundary crossing relations. Several dimensions of the relations across policy sector boundaries were revealed, including those in the realms of social relations and discourses. The relations were found often to be complex, subtle, and ambiguous, and also overlain on top of each other. These nuanced findings may not have been recognised without the careful and critical interrogation of evidence from the two districts alongside the four analytical themes and associated concepts: the relative salience, visibility and permeability of boundaries; the significance of discursive boundaries; power relationships associated with boundaries; and the potential for learning within and across boundaries.

The study's first analytical theme concerned the salience, visibility and permeability of policy-sector boundaries, including the extent to which there was recognition of potentially valuable features and also common interests across those boundaries. Here it was found, for example, that there was increased salience, visibility and permeability of tourism thinking through the setting up of new partnership-based tourism agencies in the case study districts. These organisations seem to have helped to raise awareness at times among actors in other policy sectors about tourism as a policy agenda and about its potential to provide support for urban regeneration. Another finding was that tourism's coordination across the boundaries with other urban regeneration policy sectors was reduced by the limited cross-departmental working around tourism within local government. There was also evidence that, while tourism's cross-boundary recognition in other regeneration policy sectors could be limited, it gained salience as an investment opportunity and important policy arena at a later development stage once the two districts were more firmly established as worth visiting.

Based on the second analytical theme, the study examined how discourses reflected and helped to shape the boundaries between policy sectors. It was argued, for instance, that prominent local discourses – the emphasis given to "culture", the secondary, complementary role attributed to tourism, and the value of "mixed use" development – simultaneously may have encouraged and discouraged the tourism sector's visibility and permeability across urban regeneration policy sectors. On the one hand, these narratives may have encouraged thinking about regeneration which crossed the policy-sector boundaries, including to the tourism policy sector, but they might also have hindered the regeneration policy actors from identifying and reflecting more directly on the role of tourism and their own involvement specifically in tourism. They could have obscured recognition and learning that there were some potential benefits for regeneration from a more overt and strategic approach to tourism and from more boundary-crossing activity with tourism.

The study's third analytical theme concerned power relations across the boundaries between policy sectors. It was found, for example, that local government tourism policy-sector officials tended to be less senior and influential (or powerful), which meant that in the early development of MediaCityUK in The Quays they were largely excluded from key project decisions. The tourism sector's relative influence might also be reduced because tourism was not a statutory responsibility for local government, and because the DMOs often had limited political and financial power to directly influence urban regeneration decision-making. Yet, on occasion senior tourism staff in the DMOs were involved in high-level decisions about major tourism-related development schemes, thereby increasing their cross-boundary influence.

The fourth analytical theme focused in more depth on the potential for learning within boundaries or when boundaries were crossed. Here the analysis used Akkerman and Bakker's (2011) typology of concepts or mechanisms for such learning: through identification, reflection, coordination and transformation. The presentation of the study's result sections was structured around these mechanisms.

In the case studies it was found that there was growing identification and reflection (Akkerman and Bakker's categories) about tourism's potential roles across the boundaries with other urban regeneration policy sectors. Here the new tourism partnership agencies helped to raise awareness among other actors and agencies about tourism and its potential to support urban regeneration. A few key urban regeneration policy sector actors also helped to promote learning about tourism across the boundaries with other related policy sectors. Similarly, there was some increasing coordination and possibly also transformation (Akkerman and Bakker's categories) across the tourism and urban regeneration policy sector boundaries. Again this was encouraged by the activities of new partnership-based DMOs and new Regional Development Agencies. One example was how the Regional Development Agencies encouraged local DMOs to seek to integrate their tourism marketing work with both tourism and general economic development activity.

Across the tourism and urban regeneration policy sector boundaries, however, there were significant limitations and barriers for cross-boundary learning through identification, reflection, coordination and transformation (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). Examples included how learning from coordination activity between the urban regeneration and tourism policy sectors was potentially hampered because the key policymakers for "flagship" schemes with tourism-related elements often did not include tourism specialists. One cause of this was that, unlike the key policymakers for these major projects, the public-sector tourism officials were usually lower-level and less influential. Cross-boundary consultation with tourism sector professionals by more powerful regeneration actors – with associated potential for learning about tourism issues – could also be hindered if a major project appeared to require rapid decisions. The coordination that took place could also depend on the varying personal views and understanding about tourism of a few key senior policy actors. More generally, tourism

could often be seen as having a useful but secondary role in urban revitalisation.

While tourism gradually emerged as an important policy sector (including its associated socio-economic activities) in the two districts, it could be suggested that there was scope for those trends to have been steered more effectively through tourism being given more direct and strategic attention. There was perhaps scope for the varied urban regeneration policy sectors to have sought to learn more about tourism and to cross the boundaries to the tourism policy sector more often, so as to develop tourism in more beneficial ways (including to reduce its negative impacts) in order to achieve wider regeneration objectives. Such assertions might be particularly relevant in the early development stages and in relation to the large investments in cultural facilities strongly associated subsequently with the tourism sector. Those arguments can be countered, however, by noting that tourism was an integral part of some key discourses around urban regeneration, and that tourism's high level of cross-sector integration within overall regeneration work could be regarded as a major strength, and possibly as more appropriate for wider sustainable development objectives.

The findings here about boundary relations between the tourism and other policy sectors around urban regeneration pertain to just two case study districts at a specific time. It should be noted, for example, that these districts saw the opening of major flagship cultural facilities which attracted tourists and encouraged local consideration of the tourism sector, but the notable scale of this cultural investment was not typical for many other old commercial or run-down districts in UK cities. The case study also covers a specific time period before urban regeneration professionals more regularly used such notions as the smart city, the creative city, and the resilient city (Khan & Zaman, 2018; Rossi & Vanolo, 2012). It would be interesting to explore whether these and other more recent discursive frameworks may have encouraged boundary crossing so that there is recognition in practice of the roles of tourism policies in urban regeneration work. Potentially the paper's findings could be compared and contrasted with similar relations elsewhere in other cities and also in the same districts since 2010.

Another possible extension of the present study would be to assess whether trends established in the two case study districts for relations between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors involved in urban regeneration were affected by other broad societal trends, such as the spread of urban "entrepreneurialism" and evolving political debates about inequality and welfare (Rossi, 2017). Future research might also consider how the concepts of "social capital" and "institutional capital" (Nunkoo, 2017) may assist in assessing boundary relationships between tourism and other regeneration policy sectors.

Past studies of relations between the tourism policy sector and other policy sectors have employed useful ideas about policy integration and coordination from the field of political science. But the assessment here indicated that a focus on shared analytical themes and concepts to assess varied societal boundaries and boundary crossing has potential to reveal new insights into tourism governance and also tourism's wider relationships. The boundary and boundary crossing approach also facilitated learning from research in varied social science subjects and the building of bridges to those subjects.

Finally, the paper also sought to contribute to tourism research through its argument that boundary and boundary crossing notions are highly relevant for tourism's subject matter. This is because tourism involves, for example, many partially-bounded activity systems through its assembly of varied activities and experiences. It also entails the multiple crossing of activity-system boundaries, such as because it involves travel to the places where its products are produced and experienced.

Declarations of interest

None.

Authors' contributions

The authors worked collaboratively on the paper at all stages. Seonyoung Kim led data collection and initial data interpretation as part of her PhD, gained at Sheffield Hallam University. Bill Bramwell supervised that work as her PhD Director of Studies, and he led the development of the conceptual focus on boundaries and boundary crossing. Seonyoung Kim and Bill Bramwell shared the work of developing, writing and revising the paper.

References

Aall, C., Dodds, R., Sælensminde, I., & Brendehaug, E. (2015). Introducing the concept of environmental policy integration into the discourse on sustainable tourism: A way to improve policy-making and implementation? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 23*(7), 977–989.

Abbott, A. (1995). Things of boundaries. *Social Research, 62*(4), 857–882.

Adu-Ampong, E. (2017). Divided we stand: Institutional collaboration in tourism planning and development in the central region of Ghana. *Current Issues in Tourism, 20*(3), 295–314.

Akkerman, S., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(2), 132–169.

Avdikos, V. (2011). Local hegemonic blocs: The case of tourism in Rhodes. *European Urban and Regional Studies, 18*(1), 77–92.

Bevir, M. (2009). *Key concepts in governance.* London: Sage.

Blackman, D., Kennedy, M., & Ritchie, B. (2011). Knowledge management: The missing link in DMO crisis management? *Current Issues in Tourism, 14*(4), 337–354.

Bramwell, B. (2010). Participative planning and governance for sustainable tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research, 35*(3), 239–249.

Bramwell, B. (2015). Trust, governance and sustainable tourism. In R. Nunkoo, & S. Smith (Eds.). *Trust, tourism development and planning* (pp. 26–45). London: Routledge.

Tourism collaboration and partnerships: Policy, practice and sustainability. In B. Bramwell, & B. Lane (Eds.). Channel view: Clevedon.

Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*(4/5), 411–421.

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

Bramwell, B., & Pomfret, G. (2007). Planning for lake and lake shore tourism: Complexity, coordination and adaptation. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research, 18*(1), 43–66.

Bramwell, B., & Rawding, L. (1994). Tourism marketing organizations in industrial cities. Organizations, objectives and urban governance. *Tourism Management, 15*(6), 425–434.

Briassoulis, H. (2004). Policy integration for complex policy problems: What, why and how. *Paper presented at the greening of policies: Interlinkages and policy integration conference, Berlin, Germany* 3-4 December.

Britton, S. (1991). Tourism, capital, and place: Towards a critical geography of tourism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 9*, 451–478.

Carley, M., Chapman, M., Hastings, A., Kirk, K., & Young, R. (2000). *Urban regeneration through partnership: A study in nine urban regions in England, Wales and Scotland.* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Carlile, P. (2002). A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new product development. *Organizational Science, 13*(4), 442–455.

Carlile, P. (2004). Transferring, translating, and transforming: An integrative framework for managing knowledge across boundaries. *Organizational Science, 15*(5), 555–568.

Carter, A. (2000). Strategy and partnership in urban regeneration. In P. Roberts, & H. Sykes (Eds.). *Urban regeneration: A handbook* (pp. 37–58). London: Sage.

Chen, C.-F., & Chou, S.-H. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of perceived coolness for Generation Y in the context of creative tourism – a case study of the Pier 2 Art Centre in Taiwan. *Tourism Management, 72*, 121–129.

Cheong, S., & Miller, M. (2000). Power and tourism: A Foucauldian observation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 13*(2), 371–390.

Coles, T., Dinan, C., & Hutchison, F. (2014). Tourism and the public sector in England since 2010: A disorderly transition? *Current Issues in Tourism, 17*(3), 247–279.

Dredge, D., & Jamal, T. (2015). Progress in tourism planning and policy: A post-structural perspective on knowledge production. *Tourism Management, 51*, 285–297.

Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2007). *Tourism policy and planning.* Milton, Australia: Wiley.

Edwards, D., Griffin, T., & Hayllar, B. (2008). Urban tourism research: Developing an agenda. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(4), 1032–1052.

English Tourist Board (1980). *Tourism and the inner city.* London: English Tourist Board.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* London: Routledge.

Florida, R. (2005). *The world is spiky: Globalization has changed the economic playing field, but hasn't levelled it. The Atlantic.* October.

Getz, D., Andersen, D., & Sheehan, L. (1998). Roles, issues, and strategies for convention and visitors' bureaus in destination planning and product development: A survey of Canadian bureaus. *Tourism Management, 19*(4), 331–340.

Getz, D., & Page, S. (2016). Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management, 52*, 593–631.

Gieryn, T. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: Strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists. *American Sociological Review, 48*(6), 781–795.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Harding, A., & Blokland, T. (2014). *Urban theory. A critical introduction to power, cities and urbanism in the 21ˢᵗ century.* London: Sage.

Hogl, K., Kleinschmit, D., & Rayner, J. (2016). Achieving policy integration across fragmented policy domains: Forests, agriculture, climate and energy. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, 34,* 399–414.

Inglis, D., & Thorpe, C. (2019). *An invitation to social theory.* Cambridge: Polity.

Inskeep, E. (1994). *National and regional tourism planning. Methodologies and case studies.* London: Routledge.

Jamal, T., & Camargo, B. (2018). Tourism governance and policy: Whither justice? *Tourism Management Perspectives, 25,* 205–208.

Kershaw, I. (2018). *Roller-coaster: Europe, 1950-2017.* London: Allen Lane.

Khan, S., & Zaman, A. (2018). Future cities: Conceptualizing the future based on a critical examination of existing notions of cities. *Cities, 72,* 217–225.

Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28,* 167–195.

Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of signs and space.* London: Sage.

Law, C. (1993). *Urban tourism. Attracting visitors to large cities.* London: Mansell.

Law, C. (1996). Tourism in British provincial cities: A tale of four cities. In C. Law (Ed.). *Tourism in major cities* (pp. 179–205). London: Thomson Business Press.

Law, C. (2002). *Urban tourism. The visitor economy and the growth of large cities.* London: Continuum.

Ling, T. (2002). Delivering joined-up government in the UK: Dimensions, issues and problems. *Public Administration, 80*(4), 615–642.

Longjit, C., & Pearce, D. (2013). Managing a mature coastal destination: Pattaya, Thailand. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management, 2,* 165–175.

Manente, M., Minghetti, V., & Montaguti, F. (2013). The role of the EU in defining tourism policies for a competitive destination governance. In C. Costa, E. Panyik, & D. Buhalis (Eds.). *Trends in European tourism planning and organisation* (pp. 208–219). Bristol: Channel View.

Mayrl, D., & Quinn, S. (2016). Defining the state from within: Boundaries, schemas, and associational policymaking. *Sociological Theory, 34*(1), 1–26.

Mellon, V., & Bramwell, B. (2018). The temporal evolution of tourism institutions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 69,* 42–52.

Miles, S. (2005). "Our Tyne": Iconic regeneration and the revitalisation of identity in NewcastleGateshead. *Urban Studies, 42*(5/6), 913–926.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* London: Sage.

Mullally, G., & Dunphy, N. (2015). State of play review of environmental policy integration literature. *Research series paper 7.* Dublin: National Economic and Social Council.

Nieuwland, S., & Melik, R.. Regulating Airbnb: How cities deal with perceived negative externalities of short-term rentals. Current Issues in Tourism (2018). (in press) https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1504899 Article.

Nunkoo, R. (2017). Governance and sustainable tourism: What is the role of trust, power and social capital? *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management, 6*(4), 277–285.

O'Brien, C. (1997). Form, function and sign: Signifying the past in urban waterfront regeneration. *Journal of Urban Design, 2*(2), 163–178.

One North East (2005). North East England tourism strategy 2005-2010. from http://www.onenortheast.co.uk, Accessed date: 17 December 2010.

Pachucki, M., Pendergrass, S., & Lamont, M. (2007). Boundary processes: Recent theoretical developments and new contributions. *Poetics, 35,* 331–351.

Pearce, G., & Ayres, S. (2009). Governance in the English regions: The role of the regional development agencies. *Urban Studies, 46*(3), 537–557.

Peet, R., & Watts, M. (1996). *Liberation ecologies.* London: Routledge.

Quick, K., & Feldman, M. (2011). Boundaries and inclusive public management. *Public management research association conference, June 1-3, Syracuse, New York.*

Quick, K., & Feldman, M. (2014). Boundaries as junctures: Collaborative boundary work for building effective resilience. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 24*(3), 673–695.

Richards, G., & Palmer, R. (2010). *Eventful cities: Cultural management and urban revitalisation.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Rossi, U. (2017). *Cities in global capitalism.* Cambridge: Polity.

Rossi, U., & Vanolo, A. (2012). *Urban political geographies. A global perspective.* London: Sage.

Runhaar, H. (2016). Tools for integrating environmental objectives into policy and practice: What works where? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 59,* 1–9.

Salford City Council (2004). City of Salford unitary development plan 2004-2016 (Adopted 2006). Retrieved January 20, 2015, from http://www.salford.gov.uk/udp.htm.

Salford City Council & Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council (2007). MediaCityUK & Quays Point: Salford Quays & Trafford Wharfside planning guidance. Retrieved January 20, 2015, from http://www.salford.gov.uk/d/mediacity-planning-guidance-17-01-07amended2a.pdf.

Salford City Council (2008). Salford Quays milestones: The story of Salford Quays. Retrieved January 20, 2015, from http://www.salford.gov.uk/corestrategy/eh/HB-HB04-Salford-Quays-Milestones,-the-story-of-Salford-Quays.pdf.

Sheehan, L., Vargas-Sánchez, A., Presenza, A., & Abbate, T. (2016). The use of intelligence in tourism destination management. An emerging role for DMOs. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 18*(6), 549–557.

Sjostedt, V., & Kleinschmit, D. (2016). Frames in environmental policy integration: Are Swedish sectors on track? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, 34*(3), 515–528.

Smith, A. (2012). *Events and urban regeneration. The strategic use of events to revitalise cities.* London: Routledge.

Stevenson, N. (2013). The complexities of tourism and regeneration: The case of the 2012 Olympic Games. *Tourism Planning & Development, 10*(1), 1–16.

Stoffelen, A., & Vanneste, D. (2016). Institutional (dis)integration and regional development implications of whisky tourism in Speyside, Scotland. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 16*(1), 42–60.

Struthers, T. (2003). The redevelopment of Salford Quays, Greater Manchester: Its impact on urban and regional development from 1983 to 2003. *Disp – The Planning Review, 39*(154), 11–18.

Su, R., Bramwell, B., & Whalley, P. (2018). Cultural political economy and urban heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 68,* 30–40.

Tilly, C. (2004). Social boundary mechanisms. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 34*(2), 211–236.

Tourism Tyne and Wear (2009). Cities, coast and culture: Tyne and Wear tourism management plan 2008 – 2011 (Updated 2009). Retrieved January 20, 2010 from http://www.tourismnortheast.co.uk/tourism-tyne-and-wear.

Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The tourist gaze 3.0.* London: Sage.

Visit Manchester (2008). A tourism strategy for Greater Manchester 2008-2013. from http://www.themanchestertouristboard.com, Accessed date: 8 August 2011.

Volgger, M., & Pechlaner, H. (2014). Requirements for destination management organizations in destination governance: Understanding DMO success. *Tourism Management, 41,* 64–75.

Volgger, M., Pechlaner, H., & Pichler, S. (2017). The practice of destination governance: A comparative analysis of key dimensions and underlying concepts. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage and Services Marketing, 3*(1), 18–24.

Williams, S. (2009). *Tourism geography. A new synthesis.* London: Routledge.

Wise, N. (2016). Outlining triple bottom line contexts in urban tourism regeneration. *Cities, 53,* 30–34.

Wöber, K. (1997). Local tourism organizations in European cities. In J. Mazanec (Ed.). *International city tourism. Analysis and strategy* (pp. 3–12). London: Pinter.

Zietsma, C., & Lawrence, T. (2010). Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field: The interplay of boundary work and practice work. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 55*(2), 189–221.

Seonyoung Kim is a Principal Lecturer and Tourism Subject Group Leader at Sheffield Business School, Sheffield Hallam University, UK (Email: seonyoung.kim@shu.ac.uk), where she was awarded her doctorate in tourism. She has research interests in tourism governance, tourism policy and planning, and urban tourism.

Bill Bramwell is Emeritus Professor at Sheffield Business School, Sheffield Hallam University, UK (Email: w.m.bramwell@shu.ac.uk) and Founding Co-Editor of *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, which he co-edited for 25 years. He has edited several books and had numerous research articles published in leading journals on tourism development, sustainable tourism, and tourism governance.