

**URBAN TOURISM RESEARCH PRIORITIES: CONTRASTING PERSPECTIVES OF
INDUSTRY AND ACADEMIA**

Tony Griffin
University of Technology, Sydney, Australia
Tony.Griffin@uts.edu.au

Deborah Edwards
University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Bruce Hayllar
University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT

Urban tourism has been a relatively neglected field of research, both in Australia and elsewhere, in spite of the significance of cities as a location for tourism activities. This paper seeks to redress this deficiency by reporting on the results of a recent initiative to formulate an Australian urban tourism research agenda. This involved consulting with both the academic research community and the tourism industry with a view to identifying the priority research issues in this field. Academic opinions were sought through a workshop conducted at the 2006 Council of Australian Universities in Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE) Conference, which employed a nominal group technique, and a subsequent Delphi exercise. For industry, three focus groups were conducted, involving a broad range of sectors and government agencies with an interest in urban tourism. The study revealed some similarities but also some key differences between academia and industry. Generally, academics were most concerned with issues of how tourists experienced and behaved in cities, and how their activities impacted on the urban environment and communities. Industry were concerned with a far broader range of sector-specific issues but placed most emphasis on destination development and management issues and identifying or understanding the benefits of tourism for the urban economy. Both groups, however, acknowledged the requirement to understand tourist patterns of use, needs, expectations and experiences of cities as a foundation for subsequent research and subsequently improving the performance of Australia's cities as tourist destinations.

Keywords: urban tourism, research agenda, destination planning

INTRODUCTION

The study of urban tourism is a growing area of interest as practitioners, researchers and policy makers seek to understand the phenomenon of tourism within the urban environment. As urban tourism brings together people, place and consumption, and mixes cultures, values, expectations and experiences, it provides an exciting landscape for exploration. To date, however, research in the area has been broad, lacking in integration and has not engaged sufficiently with the contextual setting of the urban environment. Moreover the research has tended to lack an overall sense of priority associated with the issues or phenomena being investigated. In particular there has been little consideration of what are the key research questions that need to be addressed in relation to tourism in urban areas, and the relative importance of these questions. Obviously, given the diversity of issues and stakeholders in urban tourism, there is much scope for there to be quite markedly differing perspectives on these questions.

This paper reports on some key differences in perspective and priority assigned to urban tourism research issues amongst two broad groups of stakeholders: the urban tourism industry and the academic research community. These differences emerged as part of the process of developing an Australian urban tourism research agenda for the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre (STCRC), one which was intended to reflect the priorities of stakeholders. In the process of developing this agenda, the opinions of both industry and academia were sought on where research was most needed in order to achieve the overall goal of improving the performance of Australian urban tourism destinations. The results indicated that, while there was agreement on some issues, there were also a number of significant differences.

BACKGROUND

While urban tourism has been subject to some research attention in recent years, this effort has arguably not reflected its degree of importance relative to tourism in other types of destinations, and little of that research has been conducted in Australia. Most of the existing research has been based on European cities, predominantly those with an historic character. The dearth of research on Australian urban tourism exists despite the fact that approximately half of all tourism in Australia can be described as urban. Table 1 indicates that, in the case of international visitors, 78% of visitor nights are spent in major Australian cities, while the corresponding percentage for domestic tourism is 41%. This scale of visitation is comparable to many of the major historic European cities (Law, 1996). Australia's cities are also significant in terms of the amount of direct tourism expenditure they generate. Table 2 indicates that in direct terms (that is, excluding any multiplier effect), international visits to major cities was worth some \$21 billion a year and domestic visits \$20 billion in 2005. Cities also perform important 'gateway' functions, with Sydney and Melbourne between them accounting for 64% of all international arrivals (Bureau of Tourism Research, 2005 CDMOTA). Hence they may be vital to the overall workings of the national tourism system.

It is observable that a number of distinctive features tend to characterise urban tourism destinations, some of which could represent focal points for research. Such features include:

- significant numbers of visitors whose primary purpose of visit is not leisure-related;
- substantial existing attractions and infrastructure generally developed for non-tourism purposes;
- a large number, variety and scale of primary and secondary attractions;
- local residents are significant, often majority, users of attractions and infrastructure;
- substantial 'gateway' effect, involving often short stays en route to other destinations;
- tourism is just one of many economic activities in the city, with implications for the awareness and perceived importance of tourism issues by business, government and residents. The competition for resources within cities also has implications for the provision of visitor services, and the cost and availability of land and labour;
- the involvement of a multiplicity of public and commercial organisations with varying levels of interest in tourism, which has implications for the complexity of planning and policy-making processes, day-to-day operational management, and the coherence of marketing activity; and
- a diverse mix of constraints on tourism as a component of urban development, including the natural environment, cultural heritage, other economic activities and local residents' attitudes, with sociocultural considerations particularly significant.

It is the complexity of these elements in conjunction with potential economic, social and environmental impacts which result from visitation that makes urban tourism research essential.

Table 1
Major city tourism in Australia 2005: visitor nights
International tourists Domestic tourists
2005 2005

City	Visitor-nights		Visitor-nights	
	'000s	%	'000s	%
Sydney	40,867	30.3	20,816	7.5
Melbourne	23,810	17.7	18,106	6.6
Brisbane	9,827	7.3	15,332	5.6
Gold Coast	6,740	5	16,260	5.9
Perth	12,719	9.4	11,661	4.2
Adelaide	5399	4	7,218	2.6
Sunshine Coast	1,993	1.5	10,965	4
Canberra	1,771	1.3	5,400	2
Darwin	1,086	0.8	3,085	1.1
Hobart	1596	1.2	3,227	1.2
Total major cities	105,808	78	112,070	41
Rest of Australia	29,050	22	163,789	59
Total	134,857	100	275,859	100

Source: Bureau of Tourism Research, 2005 CDMOTA.

Table 2
Major city tourism in Australia, 2005: expenditure patterns

City	International	Domestic Overnight	Total
	Region Expenditure	Trips Expenditure	Expenditure
	\$m	\$m	\$m
Sydney	6,820	4,230	11,050
Melbourne	4,200	3,883	8,082
Adelaide	1,308	1,177	2,485
Brisbane	2,511	2,086	4,597
Gold Coast	1,910	3,113	5,023
Sunshine Coast	800	1,678	2,477
Perth	1,973	1,868	3,841
Hobart	421	689	1,111
Canberra	576	784	1,359
Darwin	630	737	1,367
Total major cities	21,148	20,245	41,394
Rest of Australia	16,579	19,008	35,587
Total	37,728	39,253	76,981

Source: Bureau of Tourism Research, 2005 CDMOTA.

Developing a research agenda that can guide industry and government on how to more effectively develop, manage and market urban tourism destinations is important to the long term sustainability

of tourism in those settings. Consequently this project set out to answer the question: 'what are the important areas that should be included in an urban tourism research agenda for improving the performance of Australian urban tourism destinations?'. The notion of 'performance' was left deliberately broad so that it could encompass the perspectives of a diverse set of stakeholders, ranging from profit-motivated industry to government and community groups that might be more concerned with public good and quality of life issues.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior to the 1980s, research on urban tourism was fragmented and not recognised as a distinct field. Among the early studies were: Burgess (1975); Pearce's (1977) study of tourists' 'mental maps' of Oxford, based on Lynch's (1960) ideas on city imaging; Blank and Petkovich (1979); and Judd and Collins (1979). The lack of appropriate attention to urban tourism began to be acknowledged in the 1980s. Vandermeij (1984: 123) pointed out that, 'due to the present lack of data, urban tourism is amongst the most misunderstood and underestimated of all tourism types'. Pearce (1987) similarly noted the dearth of research on urban tourism. Ashworth (1989) considered this to be a serious deficiency in our understanding of tourism as a phenomenon, observing that:

There has been quite simply a rural bias noticeable in both the quantity of the literary output and the quality of the theorising about tourism. This is in itself remarkable because most tourists originate from cities, many seek out cities as holiday destinations and the social and economic impacts of tourism are substantial in urban areas. Thus the failure to consider tourism as a specifically urban activity imposes a serious constraint that cannot fail to impede the development of tourism as a subject of serious study (p.33).

Eleven years later, despite the growing volume of published work in the field (e.g.: Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1990 & 2000; Law, 1993 & 1996; Page, 1995; Murphy, 1996; Grabler & Mazanec, 1997; Mazanec, 1997; Tyler, Guerrier & Robertson, 1998; and Judd & Fainstein, 1999), Page (2000) argued that Ashworth's comments were still valid, and 'poignant', because:

the progress in research has been slow and bogged down by a large proliferation of descriptive studies and analytically devoid of assessments of tourism in individual city environments. These studies have often contributed little to the development of theory or new conceptual frameworks (p.197).

A number of authors have developed or suggested frameworks to guide urban tourism research. In his seminal paper, Ashworth (1989) outlined four extant approaches to analysing urban tourism, reflecting a geographical bias: facility, ecological, user and policy approaches. Blank (1994) proposed a functional approach, focusing on the issues of: impact, marketing, development/training needs, residents and tourism plant. Page (1996) suggested a systems framework for analysing urban tourism, but did not develop the idea fully. Fainstein and Gladstone (1997) divided urban tourism research into just two types: a political economy approach, which involved assessing the contribution of tourism to urban and regional economies and to residents' well-being; and a cultural approach, concerned with impacts on the traveller and the symbolic aspects of tourism, for example 'what is the meaning of tourism for the (post)modern world?' (p.121).

Most recently, Pearce (2001) developed a matrix which reflected a predominantly supply side approach, involving the examination of a set of issues (demand, supply, development, marketing, planning, organization, operations and impact assessment) across a range of spatial scales (city-wide, district and site). His argument was that the nature of supply will 'vary from one scale to

another along with changes in responsibility for policymaking, management, operations, and other practical applications' (Pearce, 2001: 929). He further argued that an integrative framework

should assist in identifying more clearly where future effort might be directed and how the different parties involved might come together more effectively. Likewise, a more integrated approach to planning and managing urban tourism is called for (p.931).

In the current paper, the authors sought to facilitate this process of the 'coming together' of two key parties involved: the academics who would conduct the research and generate the new knowledge; and the industry and government agencies who would use the knowledge so generated to improve the planning, management and delivery of tourism in urban areas. Fundamentally, the authors sought to determine how closely aligned were the research priorities of these two parties in relation to urban tourism, in the hope of establishing productive common ground.

METHODS

The research was conducted in three principal stages, described below.

Stage one involved a workshop held at the Council for Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE) conference in February 2006. This workshop was conducted using the nominal group technique as a consensus building tool to assist in identifying and prioritising a research focus. Participants were asked the following question:

“What are the important areas that should be included in the development of an urban tourism research agenda which can improve the performance of Australian urban tourism destinations?”

Forty-six issues were identified and used as a basis for the Delphi study in stage two. An indication of the relative importance of the issues was achieved by giving six ticks to each participant who could then allocate their ticks to the issue/s that they considered to be most important. They could assign their ticks in any way, ranging from giving individual ticks to six different issues or allocating all their ticks to one issue. Consequently, both consensus and prioritising were realised. Finally, issues were slightly reworded by the research team to ensure consistency of format in the way the issues were expressed (as questions) and to avoid confusion in the subsequent stages. Care was taken to preserve the original meaning.

In **stage two**, the Delphi Technique was used to combine expert knowledge and opinion and to arrive at an informed consensus on the important issues that should be included in an urban tourism research agenda. Academics who had a research interest, expertise or knowledge in urban tourism were targeted for the Delphi study.

The Delphi study comprised three rounds. Round one sought opinions on the forty-six issues identified in stage one and any additional suggestions that participants may have had. The second and successive rounds involved sequential questionnaires with summarised information and the feedback of opinions derived from participants in earlier rounds. In the first questionnaire participants were given the opportunity to suggest any additional issues. As a result there were 63 issues included in the subsequent rounds. Additionally the second and successive rounds asked participants to rank the issues on a Likert scale of one (1) being extremely important to seven (7) being extremely unimportant. Participants were invited to review the groups' responses in order to bring the Delphi group to consensus.

An initial invitation was sent to 25 academics asking them to participate in the Delphi study. The response rate for rounds one, two and three were 60%, 44% and 48% respectively. There was a higher response rate for the final round as one participant who was unable to contribute to round two, due to work commitments, wanted to contribute to round three.

A limitation of the Delphi technique is that consensus may not be a likely outcome. Recruiting a panel of experts representing a wide range of interests and experience is necessary to the formation of a balanced panel (Frechtling, 1996), but this can make it difficult to reach consensus as not all participants will base their opinions on perspectives shared with other participants. In this study the Delphi panel comprised experts from a wide range of disciplines which appeared to reflect their self related expertise. It is a minor problem that could be addressed in the initial stages of a Delphi by asking participants to rise above their personal interests. Murray (1979) argues that when participants drop out of further participation it may due to a strong disagreement with the growing conclusions of the panel and lead to study conclusions that are misleading. However in this study it is known to the authors that changing panel membership was the result of time and other commitments while all those who completed round two went on to complete round three.

Stage three involved three industry focus groups, held in Sydney in May and June 2006. The aim of the focus groups was to explore the research needs of government and tourism industry organisations that have an interest in urban tourism.

Table 3
Organisations represented in industry focus groups

Industry Organisations	Government Agencies
Australian Hotels Association (NSW)	City of Sydney Council
Bus and Coach Association (NSW)	Heritage Office, NSW Department of
Charter Vessels Association	Planning
Historic Houses Trust of NSW	NSW Department of Environment and
Meetings and Events Australia	Conservation, Parks & Wildlife
National Tourism Alliance	Division
NSW Taxi Council	NSW Department of Planning
Property Council of Australia (NSW)	NSW Department of State and Regional
Sydney Airport	Development
Sydney Opera House	NSW Maritime Authority
Tourism and Transport Forum	NSW Ministry for the Arts
Tourist Attractions Association	Parramatta City Council
Youth Hostels Association NSW	Sydney Convention and Visitors Bureau
	Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority
	Tourism New South Wales

A broad range of tourism industry and government representatives was invited to participate in the focus groups. Prospective participants were identified through Tourism New South Wales (TNSW) and the Tourism and Transport Forum Australia (TTF). There were a total of 24 participants across the three groups, with the organisations represented listed in Table 3. The focus groups served three purposes: firstly, to capture the research issues that were specific to the different sectors within the tourism industry; secondly, through discussion and consensus building to gain an indication of the issues of most importance to the tourism industry; and thirdly, to identify whether the ten most important issues identified by the academics in stage two had relevance for the tourism industry. In relation to that third purpose, participants were asked to rate the importance of the top ten issues

identified in the Delphi study, to provide a direct comparison between the views of academics and industry. At the conclusion of each focus group participants were asked to state what they perceived to be the most important research issue for their industry sector.

Within the time frame and budget for this project it was not possible to arrange for a totally comprehensive involvement of academics, government and tourism industry representatives. To compensate for this the Delphi study and focus groups were seen as cost-efficient methods for generating representative data. It should be noted, however, that although the project has been limited in time, it elicited a high level of interest from industry and has captured a broad range of industry and government stakeholder perspectives.

RESULTS

The Academic Perspective

The CAUTHE workshop group identified forty-six specific issues which were perceived to be important areas for research that could improve the performance of urban tourism destinations. Workshop participants grouped these issues into eight broad themes: impacts; experience and behaviour; destination development and management; spatial relationships; design; economic; definitional; and methodology. The most highly rated single issues were:

- How do tourists use cities and what are their patterns of behaviour?
- How do tourists impact on the leisure experiences, spaces and places of the local community?
- What are the benefits of urban tourism to the local community?
- How can the diversity of urban tourist experiences be maintained?
- What are the important factors that provide quality of experience for tourists and the community in urban environments?

Generally the themes of experience and behaviour, and impacts were perceived as most vital, although there were broad ranges of issues identified under the destination management and development and spatial relationship themes.

These issues that emerged from the CAUTHE workshop were used to form the basis for the Delphi study in stage two, although the first round of the Delphi study led to an additional seventeen issues being identified and subsequently considered. The outcome of the Delphi study, presented fully in the Appendix, was that few issues were considered to be of little importance. On an importance scale of 1 to 7, where the lower score reflected a higher level of importance, only two issues had scores of greater than 4, the mid-point of the scale: national capital cities as distinct destinations and the effect of globalisation and homogenisation of goods and services on visitor expenditure. The top ten issues were spread across four major themes: experience and behaviour, destination development and management; impacts; and spatial relationships. There is little difference in mean scores between the top three issues considered to be 'very important': how tourists use cities; the patterns of behaviour of tourists in urban environments; and environmental impacts in urban destinations. Similarly there is little difference between mean scores for the next seven issues considered as 'important': the influence of transport on visitor access; benefits of urban tourism; criteria for successful urban tourism development; carrying capacity; impacts; visitor dispersal; and best practice benchmarking.

The Industry Perspective

The industry focus groups identified some 240 specific research issues in total. These issues were categorised under the major themes identified at the CAUTHE workshop and further grouped under fourteen sub-themes (see Table 4). The lists of themes were not equivalent, however, as two themes identified by the academics, spatial relationship and methodological issues, did not emerge at all from the industry groups. An additional theme, relating to trends impacting on specific products or activities in urban tourism, came out of the industry groups. A fairly small number of issues were raised in relation to the economic, design and definitional themes, and hence meaningful sub-themes for these could not be identified.

Table 4
Research Themes and Sub-themes Emerging from Industry Focus Groups

Theme	Research Sub-themes
Destination development and management issues	Planning Infrastructure Management Marketing Communication Benchmarking Product
Experience and behaviour issues	Motivation Tourist experience Quality Visitor expectations Visitor behaviour
Impact Issues	Economic Social
Economic issues	<i>No sub-theme</i>
Design issues	“
Definitional issues	“
Trends	“

The research theme ‘destination development and management’ was divided into seven sub-themes: planning, infrastructure, management, marketing, communication, benchmarking and product. Arguably this was the most prominent theme for the industry and reflected perceived weaknesses in current arrangements for destination development and management, particularly with regard to achieving higher levels of coordination between government agencies and other stakeholders. Economic issues identified in stage one were not perceived by industry participants to be impact-related but rather to have a more general focus around the distribution of economic benefits, primarily as a way of demonstrating the importance of tourism within the urban economy. The economic issues identified by industry incorporated elements of both a general nature and elements that were specifically impact-related. Subsequently, economic matters have been categorised under both the broad theme of economic issues and the more specific theme of impacts. It is interesting to note that there was little concern by industry about the environmental impacts of tourism on urban destinations. Experience and behaviour was divided into five sub-themes: motivation, tourist experience, quality, visitor expectations and visitor behaviour. There was broad acknowledgement that this set of issues reflected a need for more knowledge about the urban tourist as a foundation for appropriate development, management, marketing, product development and service delivery.

A number of focus group participants emphasised the need to conduct research at a 'deeper' level. They opined that there is now sufficient information at a broad but superficial level such as purpose of visit, activities undertaken and general economic impacts. Participants wanted more specific information about those who directly and indirectly benefited from tourism, why people choose certain urban tourism destinations, and what visitors actually do in urban destinations. Improving planning practices at all levels was of major importance to industry participants and they perceived a lack of coordinated policy and planning to be an inhibiting factor to the development of a quality driven and efficient urban tourism industry.

DISCUSSION: COMPARING ACADEMIC AND INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVES

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and prioritise urban tourism research issues by seeking the views of significant sets of stakeholders. To this end it was intended to contribute to overcoming the persisting deficiencies in urban tourism research identified by authors such as Ashworth (1989) and Page (2000). This study has specifically sought to assess the research needs associated with urban tourism environments from both academic and industry perspectives, and to determine the extent to which these groups' views 'might come together more effectively' (Pearce, 2001, p931). The following discussion provides a direct comparison between these two perspectives and highlights implications for future research.

At the conclusion of each focus group, industry participants were asked to rate the importance of the top ten items that had been identified in the academics' Delphi study. The results are presented in Table 5 as a comparison with the mean importance ratings by academic participants. This simple comparison does not indicate a high level of consensus between industry and academia, in terms of either the relative or absolute importance of the various issues identified.

Overall, no items were rated as 'very important' by industry. Items ranked between 'important' and 'somewhat important' were the influence of transport on visitor access, urban tourism benefits, successful urban tourism development criteria, behaviour patterns of tourists, and benchmarking. Items ranked between 'somewhat important' and 'neither important nor unimportant' were the impacts of tourists on the leisure experience of the local community, tourist use of cities, environmental impacts on urban destinations, carrying capacity, and visitor dispersal. Overall, destination development and management issues were more prominent in industry rankings. Accessibility in terms of moving around the city, between precincts and to urban tourism destinations was also important to industry.

Generally, and not surprisingly, industry placed most emphasis on those issues that could serve their direct commercial interests rather than reflecting the broader interests of other stakeholders, such as resident communities. Impact issues, quite prominent in the view of academics, were perceived as far less important by industry, with the exception of identifying the benefits of tourism for local communities. Ostensibly the industry could perceive a self-serving interest in generating this type of knowledge, in that credible evidence of economic benefits could be used to foster increased community support for tourism development. The support for the transport/access issue could also be related to the value of such information in lobbying government with respect to transport infrastructure provision. The lower industry importance ratings for all issues could be attributed to many industry participants' relatively narrow vested interests, and a primary concern with those issues that directly affect and could impact on commercial outcomes for their industry sector. Indeed the narrower range of interests of most industry participants combined with industry participants' in-depth knowledge of their sector largely accounted for the greater number of more specific, smaller scale issues that emerged from these groups.

Table 5
Comparison of Industry and Delphi Rankings of Urban Tourism Research Issues

Academic Ranking					Industry Ranking				
Rank order	Theme*	Issue	N	Mean ^{ab}	Rank order	Theme	Issue	N	Mean ^{ab}
1	E&B	Examine how tourists use cities	12	1.5	1	SR	Analyse the influence that transport to cities has on visitor access and numbers	24	2.5
2	E&B	Identify the patterns of behaviour of tourists in cities	12	1.6	2	I	Identify the benefits of urban tourism to the local community	24	2.5
3	I	Understand the environmental impacts currently occurring within urban destinations.	12	1.8	3	DDM	Identify the criteria for successful urban tourism destination development	24	2.5
4	SR	Analyse the influence that transport to cities has on visitor access and numbers	12	2.0	4	E&B	Identify the patterns of behaviour of tourists in cities	24	2.7
5	I	Identify the benefits of urban tourism to the local community	12	2.0	5	DDM	Identify national and international best practices for urban tourism	24	2.8
6	DDM	Identify the criteria for successful urban tourism destination development	12	2.0	6	I	Understand the impacts tourists have on the leisure experience, spaces and places of the local community	24	2.9
7	I	Understand the carrying capacity of urban tourism precincts	12	2.0	7	E&B	Examine how tourists use cities	24	3.0
8	I	Understand the impacts tourists have on the leisure experience, spaces and places of the local community	12	2.0	8	I	Understand the environmental impacts currently occurring within urban destinations.	24	3.2
9	SR	Examine the linkages between attractions and how they disperse tourists within urban tourism destinations	12	2.1	9	I	Understand the carrying capacity of urban tourism precincts	24	3.4
10	DDM	Identify national and international best practices for urban tourism	12	2.1	10	SR	Examine the linkages between attractions and how they disperse tourists within urban tourism destinations	24	3.6

^a Lower scores indicate higher levels for each variable; ^b Scale Range 1 – 7 for each variable

* I - Impacts; E&B - Experience and behaviour issues; DDM - Destination development and management issues; SR - Spatial relationship issues.

The overall higher importance ratings assigned by academics was, similarly, not unexpected. The nature of academic research work typically reflects a curiosity about unanswered questions, often regardless of whether the answers will have any instrumental value. Hence the importance could attach more to the question being an interesting one to pose rather than a way of making tourism more successful in an urban destination. There are, however, some indications that academics' ratings at least partially reflect being cognizant of the needs and interests of a broader set of stakeholders involved in urban tourism, and that research should address those needs as well as those of the tourism industry.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, this study has revealed some interesting contrasts between the views of industry and academia in relation to setting priorities for urban tourism research. Both points of view are valid, however, and should be considered in the formulation of an urban tourism research agenda that is focused on improving the performance of Australia's cities as tourist destinations. In the context of a broad issue like the sustainable development of urban tourism, for example, the industry's priorities cannot be ignored if businesses are to remain competitive and viable, but the academic's priorities also acknowledge the need to consider issues of sociocultural and ecological sustainability as well. One matter on which there was general agreement is that the state of knowledge on urban tourism is currently deficient, and substantial research is needed in this rather neglected but highly significant area of Australian tourism.

REFERENCES

- Ashworth, G.J. (1989), 'Urban tourism: an imbalance in attention'. In C.P. Cooper (Ed) *Progress in Tourism Recreation and Hospitality Management* (Vol. 1, pp. 33-54). London: Belhaven.
- Ashworth, G.J. & Tunbridge, J.E. (1990), *The Tourist-Historic City*, London: Belhaven.
- Ashworth, G.J. & Tunbridge, J.E. (2000), *The Tourist-Historic City: Retrospect and Prospect of Managing the Heritage City*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Blank, U. (1994), 'Research on urban tourism destinations'. In J.R.B. Ritchie & C.R. Goeldner (Eds), *Travel, Tourism, and Hospitality Research* (pp.181-196). New York: Wiley.
- Blank, U. & Petkovich, M. (1979), 'The metropolitan area tourist: a comprehensive analysis'. Paper presented at *Travel and Tourism Research Association: a Decade of Achievement. Proceedings*, Boise, ID.
- Burgess, J.A. (1975), 'Selling places'. *Regional Studies*, 16(1), 1-17.
- Fainsten, S.F. & Gladstone, D. (1997), 'Tourism and urban transformation: interpretations of urban tourism. In O. Källtorp, I. Elander, O. Ericsson & M. Franzén (Eds), *Cities in Transformation - Transformation in Cities: Social and Symbolic Change in Urban Space* (pp.119-135). Aldershot, Hants: Avebury.
- Frechtling, D.C. (1996), *Practical Tourism Forecasting*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Grabler, K. & Mazanec, J.A. (Eds) (1997), *International City Tourism: Analysis and Strategy*. London: Pinter.
- Judd, D.R. & Collins, M. (1979), 'The case of tourism: political coalitions and redevelopment in central cities'. In G. Tobin (Ed) *The Changing Structure of Cities: What Happened to the Urban Crisis?* (pp.177-199). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Judd, D.R. & Fainstein, S.S. (eds) (1999), *The Tourist City*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Law, C.M. (1993), *Urban Tourism: Attracting Visitors to Large Cities*, London: Mansell.
- Law, C.M. (1996), *Tourism in Major Cities*, London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Lynch, K. (1960), *The Image of the City*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Mazanec, J. A. (1997), *International City Tourism: Analysis and Strategy*, London: Pinter.
- Murphy, P. E. (ed.) (1996), *Quality Management in Urban Tourism*, New York: Wiley.

- Murray, T. J. (1979), 'Delphi methodologies: a review and critique'. *Urban Systems*, 4, 153-158.
- Page, S. J. (1995), *Urban Tourism*, London: Routledge.
- Page, S.J. (1996), 'Urban heritage tourism in New Zealand: the Wellington waterfront development in the 1990s'. In C.M. Hall & S. McArthur (Eds), *Heritage Management in Australia and New Zealand: The Human Dimension* (pp. 17-20). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Page, S.J. (2000), 'Urban tourism: introduction'. In C. Ryan & S. Page (eds) *Tourism Management: Towards the New Millennium* (pp. 197-201), Oxford: Pergamon.
- Pearce, D.G. (1987), *Tourism Today: a Geographical Analysis*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Pearce, D.G. (2001), 'An integrative framework for urban tourism research'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), 926-946.
- Pearce, P.L. (1977), 'Mental souvenirs: a study of tourists and their city maps'. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 29, 203-210.
- Tyler, D., Guerrier, Y. & Robertson, M. (eds) (1998), *Managing Tourism in Cities: Policy, Process, and Practice*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Vandermeij, A. (1984), 'Assessing the importance of urban tourism: conceptual and measurement issues'. *Tourism Management*, 5(2), 123-135.

APPENDIX: DELPHI RESEARCH AGENDA ITEMS BY RANK ORDER

Rank order	Theme*	Issue	N	Mean^{ab}
1	E&B	Examine how tourists use cities	12	1.5
2	E&B	Identify the patterns of behaviour of tourists in cities	12	1.6
3	I	Understand the environmental impacts currently occurring within urban destinations.	12	1.8
4	SR	Analyse the influence that transport to cities has on visitor access and numbers	12	2.0
5	I	Identify the benefits of urban tourism to the local community	12	2.0
6	DDM	Identify the criteria for successful urban tourism destination development	12	2.0
7	I	Understand the carrying capacity of urban tourism precincts	12	2.0
8	I	Understand the impacts tourists have on the leisure experience, spaces and places of the local community	12	2.0
9	SR	Examine the linkages between attractions and how they disperse tourists within urban tourism destinations	12	2.1
10	DDM	Identify national and international best practices for urban tourism	12	2.1
11	E&B	Identify the important factors that provide a quality experience for tourists and the community in urban environments	12	2.1
12	I	Examine how tourism precincts contribute to the quality of city life	12	2.2
13	DI	Identify the impacts of physical space and design on tourist behaviour	12	2.2
14	DDM	Assess how the tourist potential of undeveloped urban precincts can be recognized?	12	2.3
15	E&B	Examine how different types of tourists use urban space	12	2.3
16	DDM	Identify the constraints to infrastructure development that affect urban tourism	12	2.3
17	I	Identify the key conflicts associated with the development of tourist precincts	12	2.3
18	DDM	Understand the transport activity that occurs within an urban destination.	12	2.3
19	EC	Assess the economic value of urban tourism in cities	12	2.4
20	DEF	Determine what an attraction is to urban tourists	12	2.4
21	EC	Understand the economic activity currently being conducted within an urban precinct.	12	2.4

CAUTHE 2007 Conference
Tourism: Past Achievements, Future Challenges

Rank order	Theme*	Issue	N	Mean^{ab}
22	SR	Evaluate the complementarity or supplementarity of different kinds of attractions to each other in urban environments	12	2.5
23	I	Identify urban resident's perceptions of tourists and tourism	12	2.5
24	DEF	Determine what a tourist precinct is	12	2.6
25	I	Identify the impacts of tourist interpretation and information in the urban environment.	12	2.6
26	DDM OR SR?	Understand intra-urban tourist transport modes, patterns and experience.	12	2.6
27	DDM	Evaluate the role of events within cities	12	2.7
28	DDM	Examine how urban precincts evolve into tourist precincts	12	2.7
29	DDM	Examine whether there is value in monitoring the performance of urban tourism destinations	12	2.7
30	SR	Identify the site and situation factors that contribute to the development of urban tourism precincts	12	2.7
31	E&B	Understand the role of safety issues in tourist decision making about an urban tourism destination.	12	2.7
32	SR	Determine if there is a requisite mix of tourist activities and attraction clusters within urban precincts/cities	12	2.8
33	EC	Determine ways in which urban tourism destinations can increase visitor expenditure	12	2.8
34	DI	Determine whether urban precincts can be developed for tourists, locals or both	12	2.8
35	SR	Examine how non-industrial inputs (eg, volunteer guiding services, taxi driver education) contribute to the success of an urban tourism destination.	12	2.8
36	EC	Examine the way in which tourism contributes to the diversity of an urban centre's economic base.	12	2.8
37	DI	Identify future tourism trends that will have implications for current urban design	12	2.8
38	DDM	Understand the power of theming (e.g. food, arts & culture, sport etc) in urban experiences.	12	2.8
39	SR	Understand the relationship between urban space and tourist	12	2.8

CAUTHE 2007 Conference
Tourism: Past Achievements, Future Challenges

Rank order	Theme*	Issue	N	Mean^{ab}
		engagement		
40	SR	Evaluate the relevance of models such as (central place, core/periphery, gravity model) for understanding the spatial relationships and their relevance to the development of tourist precincts	12	2.9
41	I	Examine the effect tourism has on the identity of urban precincts	12	2.9
42	DDM	Understand the effect of globalisation and homogenisation of goods and services on the differentiation of cities	12	2.9
43	DDM	Examine past tourism trends and their affect on future scenario planning for urban tourism.	12	3.0
44	SR	Examine whether inclusive urban tourism spaces can be created both physically and socially	12	3.0
45	DDM	Identify policies to enhance issues in tourist intra-urban mobility.	12	3.0
46	I	Determine how the legacy of events can be maintained for cities	12	3.1
47	M	Identify and evaluate methods for researching tourist experiences in urban environment	12	3.1
48	DDM	Identify cooperative planning models suitable for precinct development	12	3.1
49	I	Identify the rate of change and the implications of this change for local communities arising from urban tourism?	12	3.1
50	I	Examine the way in which various entertainment mixes impact on the desirability of urban tourism spaces.	12	3.2
51	DDM	Identify how the diversity of urban tourist experiences can be maintained	12	3.2
52	SR	Determine if there is a requisite mix of tourist precincts within a city	12	3.3
53	I	Identify the impact of urban cultures (such as the graffiti culture) in attracting (or not attracting) tourists to an urban destination.	12	3.3

CAUTHE 2007 Conference
Tourism: Past Achievements, Future Challenges

Rank order	Theme*	Issue	N	Mean^{ab}
54	D	Determine the role of tourism in the historical evolution of cities or urban tourism.	12	3.4
55	DI	Identify how urban design affects the health and safety of visitors and the community	12	3.4
56	E&B	Explore a range of high tech and high touch experiences that can act to humanise or de-humanise urban tourism environments.	12	3.5
57	I	Understand the way in which the hierarchy of cities (eg world cities etc) impact on destination attractiveness.	12	3.5
58	DI	Understand how an urban environment attracts, repels or has no particular meaning for tourists	12	3.6
59	SR	Determine whether network analysis can be applied to urban tourism	12	3.8
60	DEF	Understand the distinction between an urban tourist and a recreator.	12	3.8
61	I	Understand the impact world events can have on tourists in urban environments	12	3.8
62	DDM	Assess whether national capital cities are a distinct destination	12	4.1
63	DDM	Understand the effect of globalisation and homogenisation of goods and services on visitor expenditure in urban tourism	12	4.1

^a Lower scores indicate higher levels for each item; ^b Scale Range 1 – 7 for each item.

*I - Impacts; E&B - Experience and behaviour issues; DDM - Destination development and management issues; SR - Spatial relationship issues; DI - Design issues; EC - Economic issues; DEF - Definitional issues; M - Methodology