<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a chapter published in *Perspectives on rural tourism geographies: case studies from developed nations on the exotic, the fringe and the boring bits in between*.

Citation for the original published chapter:

Koster, R L., Carson, D A. (2019)

Considerations for differentiating among rural tourism geographies

In: Rhonda L. Koster and Doris A. Carson (ed.), *Perspectives on rural tourism geographies: case studies from developed nations on the exotic, the fringe and the boring bits in between* (pp. 253-271). Cham: Springer

Geographies of Tourism and Global Change

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11950-8_14

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published chapter.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-157700>

Considerations for Differentiating Among Rural Tourism Geographies

Rhonda L. Koster (rkoster@lakeheadu.ca)

Doris A. Carson (doris.carson@umu.se)

This is the final accepted (post-print) version of the article:

Koster, R. L., & Carson, D. A. (2019). Considerations for Differentiating Among Rural Tourism Geographies. In R. L. Koster & D. A. Carson (Eds.), *Perspectives on Rural Tourism Geographies: Case Studies from Developed Nations on the Exotic, the Fringe and the Boring Bits in Between* (pp. 253-271). Cham: Springer.

14.1 Introduction

As researchers living in and working with communities in the Boring Bits in Between (BBBs), we have often been frustrated with how both academic and practitioner approaches to rural tourism development have failed to account for the special geographic circumstances of in-between regions, and thus generated expectations and ambitions that may simply be unrealistic to achieve. We are certainly not the first to suggest that rural destinations are diverse, and that there is something between the rural fringe and the remote wilderness, as illustrated by a number of urban-rural continua, destination typologies, or spatial hierarchies identified in the literature (e.g. Lundgren, 1982; Lane, 1994; Shaw & Williams, 1994; Hall & Page, 2014; Müller, 2016; Hedlund & Lundholm, 2015). Yet, it appears that the rural tourism literature with its plethora of case studies has predominantly focused on understanding and theorising tourism at either end of the rurality spectrum: destinations close to the urban fringe (Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Weaver, 2005; Koster, Lemelin, & Agnew, 2010; see Sznajder, 2017) or more remote and exotic destinations located on or beyond the outer edges of populated peripheries (Keller, 1987; Lemelin, Dawson, Stewart, Maher, & Lueck, 2010; Müller, 2011a; Nepal, 2005; Schmallegger, Carson, & Tremblay, 2010). In contrast, tourism in the BBBs has remained comparatively neglected and under-researched (Ramsey & Malcolm, 2017). Although case studies from rural in-between places in various countries exist (for example Carson & Koster, 2015; Fullerton, 2015; Duarte Alonso & Liu, 2013; Woznicka, Koster, & Lemelin, 2010), their geographic characteristics and special circumstances as BBBs have not been explicitly conceptualised. As we have argued at the outset of this volume, a lack of consideration for the particularities of rural does little to aid in our understanding of, support for and ultimately development of tourism across all rural areas.

Our aim is not to privilege the BBBs over the fringe or exotic remote geographies in the discussion that follows, as we truly believe that each of these regions deserves academic and policy attention. However, based on our own research preoccupation with tourism in such regions, and the dearth of information that appropriately contextualizes them, our analysis does give considerable attention to these areas that due to their 'in-between-ness' are also 'forgotten' (Coates & Morrison, 1992), and thus we would argue, experience certain disadvantages. They have sparse and declining populations due to increasing concentration of

people, services and economic growth in regional centres, at the same time they experience a loss of economic importance and political status, and a commensurate lack of prospects for new major development projects. These factors may not be unique to the BBBs, but the level of disadvantage is; that is, their conditions are often not bad enough to warrant special attention which conspires to lock the BBBs in a rather neglected and forgotten position on regional and national development agendas. Indeed, their limited importance is illustrated in how they are often ‘lumped together’ into relatively large regional conglomerates for administrative purposes (health, education, regional economic development and of course, tourism regions). Our aim, therefore, is to ensure they are not forgotten within a continuum of rural tourism geographies.

The intent of this chapter is not to re-compare the geographies, but to position their unique tourism characteristics as situated within particular locations, based on the contextual factors of our framework (see Table 1, Chapter 1). Our work has illustrated that despite numerous commonalities that end up uniting rural tourism under one homogenous umbrella, there are differences among the diverse types of rural geographies that require our attention. We begin by critically examining the various tourism products, markets and industry characteristics to unpack their similarities and differences through spatial, socio-economic and institutional considerations. This analysis points to the specificities associated to each type of rural geography, and in particular, how these take the form of unique opportunities and challenges that must be acknowledged and addressed to both advance our knowledge of the complexities of tourism in these locales, and importantly, to develop policies, programs and structures that can adequately address the differences in rural tourism geographies.

14.1.1 Some Spatial Considerations

Understanding tourism dynamics in rural areas requires consideration of their location in relation to source markets and their accessibility. Exotic remote destinations are, by their very nature, located at significant distance from key markets, with limited direct transportation access. Instead, visitors must be willing to commit considerable time, effort and often expense to reach these regions. Often, these destinations are based on naturally occurring iconic features, rendering the complexities of access as less important than obtaining the experience (Prideaux, 2002a).

For the fringe communities, being located next to large urban centres with well-developed and integrated road networks, often in combination with rail or air transportation options, provides access to large markets, including international opportunities. The green belts and agricultural landscapes surrounding metropolitan centres provide an immediate connection to ‘rural’, and given various nations’ growing focus on connections to sustainability, locally produced goods and services, farm to table culinary options and the ‘slow’ movement, such places have a locational advantage in the fringe (Fullagar, Markwell, & Wilson, 2012; Sznajder, 2017).

The limited linkages with and distance from urban core centres, issues around transport accessibility, and their particular physical environment make tourism challenging in the BBBs. Often, these are places several hours by road from their nearest administrative urban core centres and are thus located beyond reasonable daily commuting distance. A dependence on transit corridors equates to such places relying heavily on visitor markets coming from much further afield, and while perhaps strategically well positioned to capture ‘incidental’ visitors (Ramsey & Malcolm, 2017), our BBB cases have shown that retaining such transit

travellers in town, or even attracting ‘purposeful’ visitors who come specifically to experience certain aspects of the destination (such as the heritage attraction in Peterborough), remains a major challenge for the BBBs. They are often located ‘on the way to somewhere else’ that is more remote, iconic or more developed, emphasising their role as ‘in-between’ stopovers that are sitting low on regional destination hierarchies and tourist itineraries.

The BBBs and exotic remote locations are both quite vulnerable to changes in modes of transport or travel patterns that affect the choice of transit routes or stopover locations (Leiper, 1990; Flogenfeldt, 2005). For example, changes in interstate touring route patterns along Lake Superior after 9/11 (BBBs) or the continuous decline of the long-haul coach touring market in Outback Australia (exotic) are examples of how volatile transit markets can be. While space-time compression following improvements in transport technology and increasing individual mobility may improve access to more remote places (Hall, 2005), it may simultaneously lead to an increasing marginalisation of the in-between regions as they are no longer needed as service stopovers or get bypassed altogether (Whyte & Prideaux, 2007; Holyoak, Carson, & Schmallegger, 2009).

Reliance on road transport coupled with distance and difficulty of access creates a disadvantage for the BBBs from a distance decay perspective compared to exotic destinations, as remote resort towns are often accessible by multiple forms of transport, including purpose-built airports (Halpern, 2008; Schmallegger & Carson, 2010; see Müller and Scott & Pashkevich this volume). The relatively low economic and political status of the BBBs means that they are usually not in a position to expect any major transport investments and other infrastructure upgrades that could help them improve issues around accessibility and market attractiveness. This is in contrast to the exotic remote locations, which are often better positioned to attract external investment, either due to their perceived suitability for major project development (as in the case of remote mining towns or tourism resorts) (Müller, 2016), or due to their more extreme locational and socio-economic disadvantage requiring government intervention (as in the case of remote Indigenous or Inuit communities).

Rather homogeneous agricultural and natural amenity landscapes make it difficult for both fringe and BBBs destinations to attract visitation as they offer few opportunities for differentiation from other similar and proximal destinations. Unlike their more remote and exotic counterparts where tourism experiences are often tied to iconic natural attractions, the BBBs suffer from high substitutability and competition from communities with similar features located within their region, and with those located nearer to urban core markets. Likewise, in many fringe destinations, there is little to differentiate agricultural or viticultural products and locations from one another, and when coupled with short commuting distance, can result in limited overnight visitation to these regions. In this way, distance decay of visitor volumes and competition from multiple intervening opportunities (Hall, 2005; Lew & McKercher, 2006) present challenges for tourism industries in both the BBBs and fringe destinations compared with those in more exotic remote destinations (Prideaux, 2002a).

14.1.2 Some Historic and Contemporary Socio-economic Considerations

The natural resource foundation of rural areas impacts the tourism development trajectory across all rural geographies in some common to all, and in other unique to some, ways. What is common is that tourism is largely considered a marginal commercial activity within the context of their broader economic structure. The exception is for those regions where

products have scaled to mass tourism-like attractions requiring significant physical infrastructure, management regimes, and employment (for example the casino and convention centre of Niagara Falls, or ski resorts in Sweden). In such cases we see that tourism has either been a major driver within the local economy, or evolved alongside other industries, and is recognized and valued for its economic contribution.

What is unique for those areas with historic reliance on single industries, is that tourism development appears to have emerged as a result of economic crisis (closure of railway, mill or manufacturing plant); this is significant in the BBBs and fringe communities that are more distant from the urban core.¹ Unlike some remote exotic destinations that may evolve as 'greenfield' developments or instant tourism resort towns without any significant pre-tourism settlement history (Schmallegger & Carson, 2010), tourism in the BBBs has usually emerged much later along local development paths. In places that evolved dependent on natural resource industries, tourism has had to find its place within the wider socio-economic fabric and industrial legacies of such resource towns, when those economies failed. Based on our fringe case studies in Canada and Australia, it appears that a similar agricultural and associated manufacturing reliance (and subsequent closure) also results in tourism development consideration during times of crisis. In both BBB and fringe geographies, locals often hold fast to their historic occupational identity, pinning for the return of that industry and not engaging with tourism as part of their local economy (Fleischer & Felsenstein, 2000; Petrzalka, Krannich, Brehm, & Koons, 2005; Reed, 2003; Mason & Cheyne, 2000). Considering local pre-tourism histories is therefore critical when trying to understand why certain infrastructure provisions, transport connectivities, mobility patterns, community identities or heritage assets exist that subsequently influence the extent, nature and role of tourism as part of local development efforts (Müller, 2016; Carson & Carson, 2011; Mitchell & Shannon, 2018).

In several of our case studies (Tärnaby/Hemavan, Malå, Peterborough and Niagara), the authors have emphasised the value of applying a historic and evolutionary economic geography lens (see Brouder, Clavé, & Ioannides, 2017) to examinations of local tourism development, focusing on how path-dependent processes and legacies inherited from previous development paths have affected community aspirations and development approaches to tourism. In particular for all the BBBs cases, Niagara in the fringe, and Nunavut as an exotic case, the lifecycle stage of the (previously) dominant industry appears to be critical in determining the type and scale of local tourism development efforts.

These local economic pre-tourism histories have also shaped the extent of entrepreneurship and economic linkages at the local level, which may explain the comparatively low level of local private sector capacity to drive economic diversification to some degree (Carson & Carson, 2011; Wilson, Fesenmaier, Fesenmaier, & Van Es, 2001). Historic reliance on few large-scale employers has resulted in blue-collar worker towns, meaning that while there are exceptions, the entrepreneurial spirit has traditionally been low and the few local private businesses that exist have primarily emerged in co-dependence with the dominant industry employer. In particular, single-industry towns like Peterborough and Terrace Bay, or small agricultural fringe communities in the Niagara and Barossa regions, have essentially evolved as towns serving a special purpose, without developing linkages or synergies with other local industries. Not only has this reinforced a lack of local economic diversity with associated vulnerabilities, but it has limited the extent to which particular industry legacies (e.g. infrastructure, businesses, networks, skills) could be repurposed to stimulate development in a new industry like tourism at a later stage. Even though local hospitality businesses have

long been providing services to business travellers or contractors associated with the dominant industries, this does not seem to have created a strong local visitor service mentality that could be redirected to exploit new forms of tourism following times of economic crisis. As such, cognitive lock-in and a lingering ‘addiction’ to working primarily around old single-industry structures (Freudenburg, 1992), has clearly been an issue in several of our cases, with many local service providers not considering themselves as being part of tourism or the visitor economy (Andrebeck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005; Petrzalka et al., 2005).

Limited entrepreneurship is not the situation in our exotic cases (Nunavut, Tärnaby/Hemavan and Katherine), nor for the large-scale developments in the fringe studies of Niagara (casino and convention centre) and Dalarna (ski resort). In these locations, external investment and operators have played a significant role in the development of tourism attractions and accommodations, which have formed similar to tourism enclaves. Though research has largely dealt with resort destinations as enclaves within the pleasure periphery (for example, Naidoo & Pearce, 2018; Naidoo & Sharpley, 2016; Freitag, 1994), there are parallels with our cases in that tourism enclaves have evolved due to significant investment that is often provided by various levels of government and external corporations, leading to repatriation of tourism revenues to outside owners, with limited benefit to the local economy, a commensurate limitation for decision making by local stakeholders (Monterrubioa, Osorioa, & Benítez, 2018) and both tourism-related mobilities and relationships between tourists and locals being spatially regulated to a focused area (Saarinen, 2016). In our case studies, these tourism enclave-like developments have contributed to a lack of linkages between the attraction and other community businesses and limited support for broader entrepreneurial developments, thus potentially restricting the establishment of a stronger tourism destination and economy within these regions.

To date, the scale and nature of local tourism developments appear to have had few impacts on changing demographic and socio-economic indicators in our three BBB cases. The number of new jobs and businesses generated by largely government funded attractions and ‘free-to-use’ infrastructure has remained low. Similarly, new migration streams of amenity migrants, the creative class, and lifestyle entrepreneurs—at times described as contributing to economic and demographic renewal in various high-amenity tourism zones or urban fringe areas—have been conspicuously absent in our BBBs (Vuin, Carson, Carson, & Garrett, 2016). The lack of new post-productive migration streams may also simply have been about an absence of ‘favourable contingencies’, particularly as other nearby settlements have at times succeeded in attracting new creative migrants and entrepreneurs for no apparent reason other than fortuitous discovery and subsequent chain migration (Carson, Carson, & Eimermann, 2018; Vuin et al., 2016). In contrast, and as may be expected, our Canadian and Australian fringe cases are experiencing population growth due to second home and amenity migration. Demographic shifts are also apparent in the exotic locales, but it is only in Sweden’s case study that growth can be attributed to tourism-related migration; in both the Canadian and Australian contexts, population growth is due to high birth rates among Inuit/Indigenous populations.

A discussion around the relationships between local development histories, socio-economic characteristics, and tourism potential across all geographies requires some consideration of the particular Indigenous contexts. In our BBBs, only Malå has visible signs of past and contemporary Sami culture (i.e. heritage buildings and reindeer herding respectively). Peterborough and Terrace Bay, on the other hand, have evolved as purpose-built single-

industry towns that excluded any formal Indigenous involvement from local settlement and development plans. Colonial settlement to extract, refine and transport natural resources has in many BBBs (particularly in the Australian and Canadian context) led to a disappearance, displacement and/or marginalization of local Indigenous people from non-Indigenous settlements (Ray, 2010; Cornell, 2006). Unlike in some of our more exotic and remote case study jurisdictions (Nunavut in Canada, the Northern Territory in Australia, or the mountain Sami areas of Swedish Lapland), our BBB case studies thus do not have a particularly strong Indigenous presence as part of their regional identity which could provide the basis for a differentiated tourism destination brand. Likewise, we have no examples of Indigenous tourism within any of our fringe case studies², which speaks to both the nature of Indigenous settlement locations and the relationships between Indigenous peoples and their settler counterparts.

14.1.3 Some Institutional Considerations

In all three geographies, various levels of government have played differing roles in supporting tourism developments. In particular for the BBBs, local government has emerged as one of the leading stakeholders in driving both local tourism development and regional collaboration efforts. This may in part reflect the relatively weak private industry capacities prevalent in the BBBs, but it may also reflect the fact that local governments have long had to assume strong leadership roles to compensate for the lack of higher-level government interest and downloading of responsibility (Bryant, 1992). With local governments being naturally more concerned with local rather than regional issues, localised parochial approaches to tourism (and economic development more generally) may therefore be unwittingly reinforced. For both the fringe and exotic locations, local and higher levels of government have invested in tourism infrastructure; in both cases, private sector investment in the larger scale tourism enterprises have generated commercial growth and employment at the scale that might be expected.

Another common characteristic for all the rural geographies are institutional challenges concerning formal tourism management regimes (including regional tourism organizations (RTOs), destination marketing agencies (DMOs) and tourism/economic development officers). In the fringe cases, this manifested as a lack of integration among agencies or government ministries responsible for regional economic development, meaning that tourism is not an integrated part of the overall economic development planning discussion or framework (Hall, 2008). Additionally, corporate-based attractions in the fringe seem to work with the RTO, but independent of other sub-regional tourism organizations, thus contributing to the limited development of, and integration with, complimentary tourism businesses at local levels. This phenomenon is replicated in the exotic case studies, where RTOs might work with the externally operated tourism attractions/products, but have limited networks between and with other communities and businesses within the region, further creating an enclave-like tourism environment.

The expansive geographic regions created to oversee tourism in the BBBs further suggest that they are not seen as special enough to warrant a smaller regional administrative unit with a focused identity of their own (Carson, Carson, & Hodge, 2014). This is in contrast to more exotic remote and localised development ‘hotspots’ (e.g. isolated resort or mining towns), which are considered too distant, different and disconnected from other settlements in the surrounding sparsely populated environment to form a large and integrated region (Carson, Ensign, Rasmussen, & Taylor, 2011; Taylor, 2016). Similarly, regions closer to the urban

fringe often retain a more narrow regional identity that provides opportunities for differentiation and demarcation from their neighbours. This may be partly because of the more deeply embedded historic roles of the fringe areas and their reciprocal relationships with the city (e.g. a certain area having developed as a winery or horticulture backyard for the city, as discussed in the case of the Barossa Valley and Niagara regions), and partly because of the higher density of settlements encouraging more competition and regional differentiation.

The tourism organizations at the sub-regional level are almost exclusively focused on marketing, and face common challenges, across all geographies. They struggle with financial sustainability, and appear to lack professional capacity for product development and collaborative network building. Nowhere is this more clearly evident than within the BBBs where networking between the RTOs, sub-regional DMOs and individual towns and municipalities continues to be a challenge. This is exacerbated by the perception (and often reality) that at the local level, they have to compete for attention from the regional tourism organisation that is understood to be focused on its more remote attractions or urban gateway communities, and not on finding ways to assist with integrative planning of attractions, products, and services to build a regional tourism economy.

As this summary of the institutional structures responsible for rural tourism clearly illustrates, there is a consistent and persistent lack of integration in tourism development across all geographies. We are not the first to recognize that limited integration hinders the abilities of tourism to contribute to rural development. Hall, Kirkpatrick, and Mitchell (2005) identify several challenges for rural tourism business sustainability mirrored in our own analysis, including competition (ability to recognize changing markets, undertake differentiation and create quality product), marketing (differentiating product and getting the word out, coordinating at regional levels), cooperation and networking (expanding the range of businesses working collaboratively, building synergies and complementarity), and adoption of innovations (remaining relevant and accessible within a globalizing and technologically advancing society). Saxena and colleagues' work (Saxena, Clark, Oliver, & Ilbery, 2007; Saxena & Ilbery, 2008, 2010) is particularly instructive, having defined integrated rural tourism as, "tourism that is mainly sustained by social networks that explicitly link local actors for the purpose of jointly promoting and maintaining the economic, social, cultural, natural, and human resources of the localities in which they occur" (Saxena & Ilbery, 2008, p. 234). As they identify, when integrated, tourism can permeate local and regional economies, leading to direct income benefits for those involved and more broadly for localities based on their association, synergy, and participation (Saxena & Ilbery, 2008, p. 234). Their work has demonstrated the requirements for, and outcomes of, the integrated rural tourism ideal; what our case studies illustrate is that when such linkages are not formed (or are broken) for a variety of reasons, tourism endeavours have a limited ability to contribute to the local and regional economy. When we couple the importance of these linkages with the challenges associated with tourism organizations, the worrisome question becomes whose role is it to ensure these linkages are formed and nurtured? If it is the RTO's role, how can this be accomplished given the often vast geographic territories that are assigned to one RTO for both the exotic and BBB geographies, and the limited professional functionalities at the sub-regional level? What role do local governments have in trying to 'make' this happen? Saxena and Ilbery (2010) in their study of the English/Welsh border lands point to the disconnect between these larger agencies and their understanding of the needs of enterprises at the community level, versus the values placed on both big and small attractions, products and events at the sub-regional and local levels; this further supports our concern regarding

where to place the responsibility for tourism integration in overcoming the challenges associated with a lack of integration.

Further, regional collaboration and integration need to be questioned in terms of whether the region makes sense from a spatial, historic or mobility point of view (Carson et al., 2014; Dredge, 2005), especially given the large geographies that are often bound together for various administrative purposes. The BBB cases are particularly instructive in this regard. Peterborough has been largely disconnected from the region it had been assigned due to its different landscape, local economic history, transport corridors, as well as visitor markets and itineraries. Terrace Bay has found itself challenged to collaborate with other towns along Lake Superior which essentially see themselves as competing with similar assets for the same narrow market. Even though public sector stakeholders have in both cases sought to increase regional collaboration for the sake of new tourism projects (and other development initiatives), issues around local parochialism, a lack of regional thinking, historic rivalries and resistance from other communities persist, thus raising questions about the perceived utility of imposed regional marketing and development projects. In the case of Malå, one could further argue that the town does not need to collaborate with the broader region for tourism marketing and development, as it can simply draw on its own market niche through targeting skiing tourists and second home owners from the nearby coast, while the regional DMO pursues different (largely external) target markets that may not be of relevance or interest to Malå.

14.1.4 Key Points of Differentiation across the Rural Geographies - Sometimes Opportunities, Sometimes Challenges!

As we have outlined, there are several common characteristics across rural geographies (a limited understanding of tourism's contribution to the wider economy, a lack of capacity within the tourism planning/management organizations, restricted networking and collaboration to integrate tourism within local and regional economies, and a level of historical adherence to pre-tourism economic industries). What is central to the premise of this volume, however, is that there are aspects that differentiate these rural geographies and present unique opportunities and challenges for rural tourism. We now turn to these defining elements.

Unique tourism opportunities in the rural...

...fringe: rural idyll and accessible market volumes.

It is the combination of the rural idyll and access to a large market that is an opportunity distinct to the rural fringe. As urbanization continues, people are often seeking the opportunity to escape the urban jungle and return to a simpler time, quiet spaces, friendly people, a more natural and sustainable environment; in a phrase, the rural idyll (Bell, 2006). Whether or not the fringe offers an authentic experience of rurality (Frisvoll, 2013) is another question altogether. However, the supply of potential visitors from large metropolitan centres is significant (see Sznajder, 2017) and offers opportunities for rural communities within the fringe to develop attractions and products for urban visitors. The bulk of visitation seems to be made up of day trip and weekend markets, with festivals, events, rural recreation activities, markets, wine-based, culinary, and agritourism making up the product offering (see Sznajder, 2017; Koster, Lemelin, & Agnew, 2010). As such, there is a wide array of opportunities for local and regional entrepreneurs, businesses and service providers to become involved in the

tourism economy. Second home ownership also seems to be a related opportunity within the fringe, where housing costs are lower and commuting is an option.

...exotic remote: climate/environment and Indigenous experiences.

The remote location of our case studies sets them apart in terms of their unique environments and associated climatic characteristics. Factors associated with climate change have presented tourism opportunities for both Nunavut and Tärnaby/Hemavan. In the first case, longer ice-free seasons have opened up access for cruise ship and other vessels to visit the communities of the north, creating opportunities for ‘bucket list’ and ‘first/last chance’ marine tourism markets (Johnston, Viken, & Dawson, 2012). For the Swedish case, better snow security and a comparatively longer ski season than southern resorts may provide a competitive advantage, particularly as the development of an international airport across the border in Norway may facilitate increased international visitation.

There has been limited engagement with Indigenous populations for tourism within the exotic remote locations, and yet there is opportunity to do so both from a supply (availability of people and product) and demand (interest in Indigenous tourism) side. Within the context of Nunavut, implementation for tourism (and other economic) development plans is based on building capacity for Inuit engagement. While this is a relatively new initiative and the outcomes are not known, it is a positive sign that such measures are being identified and addressed. In contrast, there are limited connections with Indigenous people and associated product in the other two cases. For operators in Katherine, being disconnected from the Nitmiluk National Park has not served them well, and establishing new connections might assist in providing greater opportunities to retain their business and VFR markets longer. In the case of Tärnaby/Hemavan, strengthening connections with regional Sami may also extend visitor length of stay, as they may wish to access such cultural experiences, particularly during the summer and shoulder seasons. We only advocate for the development of Indigenous tourism products in situations where Indigenous people are involved in developing and delivering authentic experiences, so as to avoid cultural appropriation and continued contemporary forms of colonialism (Notzke, 2006; Butler & Hinch, 2007; Martinez, 2012).

...BBBs: regional markets, realistic developments, and tourism as a non-option.

Our Swedish case has shone a light on the importance of regional tourism markets. Malå is located on a road to nowhere, requiring travellers to undertake substantial detours to access the destination. As such, Malå has had to make an effort to find its tourists and has done so in two ways—by positioning itself as a less expensive intervening opportunity to the more remote and more expensive skiing resorts in the west (see Müller, this volume), and by attracting frequent repeat visitors from the nearby coast. By targeting a rather small, accessible and loyal regional market, Malå has thus been able to circumvent its locational disadvantage. This case illustrates two central points about opportunities for tourism in the BBBs. The first is the importance of questioning the role of tourism within a local economy—is it necessary to be a significant financial contributor, or can it be a sector that provides additional revenue streams for local businesses which sustain their operations thus preventing further decline in rural areas? Second, it illustrates that regional markets are small but lucrative for tourism in the BBBs. While in reference to second home ownership, Müller (2011b) notes that such ‘localised’ markets are not always recognised as ‘tourists’ or commercially valuable visitor markets, yet both the cases of Malå and Terrace Bay illustrate that for the BBBs, these markets form a strong and reliable visitation pool that aids in sustaining local businesses, community services, and recreational facilities that might not

otherwise be viable. Hence, despite facing challenges as being just another BBB from an external (international, national or provincial) market point of view, places like Terrace Bay and Malå may simultaneously develop into a sort of urban fringe destination for their regional centres and redirect their tourism efforts to capitalise on smaller, yet potentially more accessible and loyal, regional source markets.

Bridging local government-industry divides, and embedding tourism at a local community level, appear to be key to securing more sustainable tourism pathways in the BBBs. Adjusting the scale and type of tourism to local capacities and more realistic expectations could be one way to achieve this, as illustrated in two of our case studies (Malå and Terrace Bay). Local governments have kept tourism growth aspirations comparatively low and focused on markets and/or infrastructure priorities that were realistic to achieve. While such low-profile tourism strategies are unlikely to raise more attention and support within higher-level government organisations, it is also clear that these initiatives are less vulnerable to fluctuating economic and political priorities, and potentially more durable and sustainable in the long term. Certainly, other research has illustrated that developing local community assets and retaining them for residents' use does lead to better outcomes relating to integration and sustainability (Saxena & Ilbery, 2010; George, Mair, & Reid, 2009).

Questions remain, however, around the extent to which such tourism development approaches will ever be able to generate economic return on investment and diversify local economies to become less dependent on 'boom and bust' resource cycles; herein lies the third opportunity within the BBBs. These case studies (and others we have worked on beyond this volume) have indicated the importance of assessing whether or not tourism is an appropriate economic development option for a given location. Beyond undertaking the appropriate research and planning associated with tourism developments, local stakeholders need to question what their intentions are for tourism development (replacing the lost resource-based industry? projects to improve quality of life for residents and visitors alike?), proceed (or not) with appropriate investment/developments (Reid, 2003; George et al., 2009) and then assess the outcomes based on their original intent (Koster & Randall, 2005). Without determining the purpose of the tourism developments, it is impossible to assess the success of the outcome. Using this metric, the case of Peterborough illustrates that tourism development as a replacement for lost industry was not successful, and suggests that perhaps it was a doomed development choice from the outset.

Unique challenges for tourism in the rural...

... fringe: urban core as supplier and competitor.

While a unique advantage may be the opportunity to easily access a large, proximal urban market as the supplier of visitors to the rural attractions available in the fringe, the catch-twenty-two is that the same urban supplier is also a direct competitor for overnight visitation (as illustrated in the case of the Barossa and Niagara). When that is coupled with the limited integration with other complementary businesses (accommodations, retail, restaurants etc.) present in rural areas, it is difficult for the rural fringe to compete in attracting longer-term stays. Urban growth, issues around sub-urban sprawl and gentrification (as in the Barossa and Niagara), as well as economic pressure to allow cosmopolitan development (as in Dalarna), are also challenges unique to fringe destinations as they threaten the traditional landscapes, industry and community structures, and images of the 'rural idyll' that have been central to their tourism strategies.

...exotic remote: external or monopoly ownership.

Enclaves have been created through external or monopoly ownership within the exotic remote locations. This has challenged the local organizations responsible for marketing and developing tourism within the wider region, as there has been limited opportunity to work collaboratively and integrate local businesses for wider economic benefit. If viewed through a tourism area life-cycle lens (Butler, 1980), it has meant that as Katherine in the Northern Territory entered the consolidation phase, the monopoly owner of its attractions and services, in adhering to old markets and relationships, could not revitalize the product which has entered into decline. For Tärnaby/Hemavan, once the monopoly ownership was lifted, it was able to enter into a revitalization stage on the timeline, as new external ownership and a different regional tourism organization structure has allowed for renewal of the winter tourism product and expansion into other seasons. In the case of the ‘emerging’ tourism region in Nunavut, marine tourism products are exclusively operated and organized by external owners, with limited engagement with local businesses other than those on their land-based itinerary stops. At this stage in their development trajectory, there has been limited capacity for the Inuit peoples to become involved; the territory has developed a strategic plan that may aid in moving communities into the development phase of the tourism area life cycle.

...BBBs: high substitutability and homogeneity of product; large geographic regions to manage.

Unlike their geographical counterparts, the BBBs suffer from a combination of rather homogenous natural landscapes that are vast in geographical scale (boreal forest, desert outback), rendering communities and attractions as easily substitutable for one another. Creating value-added attractions based on niche heritage elements (trains, lighthouses, or roadside attraction) does little to create the necessary product differentiation that can draw visitor volumes, create reasonable return on investment, and justify the original spending of tax payer dollars. With limited local private sector linkages emerging, heritage attractions remain dependent on continuous government funding and management (Prideaux, 2002b), and may ultimately lead to community tensions and political conflicts (as illustrated in the case of Peterborough). As a result, honestly assessing the appropriateness of tourism development (its scale, its investment, its purpose, and the intended outcome) is critical.

These challenges, while varied to each geography, require solutions that are common and connect to their shared challenges outlined at the beginning of this section. Of paramount importance is the need to address professionalization within the tourism organization structures (regional tourism organizations, destination marketing organizations and economic/tourism development officers). These staff require the necessary background training and skill set to adequately engage in research to develop product, build capacity and collaboration among stakeholders, and develop robust marketing programs. They cannot simply engage in website development and brochures to promote the same old (tired) product in the region to the same old (and diminishing) market. Staff in sub-regional DMOs in particular need training to foster and nurture the integration of tourism within their local economies, working with various businesses and operators (within tourism and beyond) to help them understand how they are part of the tourism industry (Åberg, 2017). In fringe and exotic remote locations where corporations own attractions, it is critical to have them as part of the local or regional network, even though they may not feel they ‘need’ the smaller enterprises. At the RTO level, staff need to network with other industry and levels of government ensuring that ‘tourism is at the table’ of wider economic and resource development discussions to build tourism as part of the regional economy.

While government has an important role to play in supporting tourism development, we would challenge the policy that drives funding programs and parameters, leading to what Stern and Hall (2010) have termed the ‘proposal economy’. Short term project funding challenges local government abilities to pursue long-term plans for economic diversification and community development (Koster, 2008). This is a reality for many rural places, but significantly in the BBBs where fluctuating resource cycles, weak political institutions, and precarious funding environments prevail. In such scenarios, tourism often becomes a project for local governments precisely because the funding for such development is what is available. On the one hand, such projects may provide short-term benefit to the local economy, a sense of positivity (‘something is happening in our town’) and contribute to perceived quality of life. On the other hand, reliance on the proposal economy can further entrench tourism’s dependence on public sector funding, leadership and expertise. It can also deepen the divide between the public sector (with the necessary skills to obtain and manage project grants), and a private sector industry that is less prepared to navigate the vagaries of external market and funding conditions in tourism (Åberg, 2017). Conflict of interest and a lack of public-private collaboration, as observed in Peterborough, may emerge as a consequence in the long term, particularly in situations where the already small and fragmented local industry does not see itself as being part of the tourism system or considers tourism as delivering few tangible economic or community benefits.

14.1.5 Some Final Thoughts

Butler (2015, p. 24) argues that, “we ignore the need for research on current problems relating to tourism at our peril. We have both an opportunity and an obligation to address these problems, and in an era when the ‘value’ of research means more than just an academic contribution to knowledge...we should be taking advantage of this opportunity”. We have tried to accomplish this by not only pointing out the geographic differences, but illustrating that in fact these differences matter in the ways that we should be addressing contemporary challenges within rural tourism and question, as others have done before (Mair, 2006; Müller & Jansson, 2007; Hall, 2007), the mantra that tourism is a cure-all for rural economies in crisis.

Various researchers (for example, Laws & Scott, 2003; Pearce & Butler, 2010; Franklin & Crang, 2001) have suggested that tourism research needs to mature; part of the process is moving beyond individual case studies situated within a particular theoretical framework, but not connected to a larger body of work. Case studies of particular destinations and places form part of the foundation of our scholarship in tourism geography, but have limitations in moving us to a more comprehensive and critical understanding of a particular segment, or more broadly, of tourism scholarship. Edited volumes have provided some cohesion, but are limited in their contribution to this endeavour due to structure; chapters are requested that contribute to a common theme, with editors then either trying to illustrate the connections in outlining the organization of the book, or in pulling together lessons learned in the conclusion. While such volumes have provided invaluable contributions to our collective knowledge base, our aim was to structure our book in a way that allowed obvious cross case analysis, ultimately building both a theoretical and practical understanding of different rural tourism geographies.

Our central argument is that rural is not a homogenous space, but is in fact different in sometimes obvious and other times nuanced ways. Selecting cases from countries similar

enough to avoid significant variances in cultural, political, economic and geographic size attributes, created a common starting place for comparison of rural spaces. In requiring each case to address the same range of characteristics, both non-tourism (spatial, historic, socio-economic) and tourism related (product, market, industry, institutions), we ensured that we had the same contextual factors to compare both within and across the different geographies. What we did allow variation in, was the theoretical frameworks through which each case study was investigated. While there were some common choices made (path dependency and evolutionary economic geography informed the four case studies of Tärnaby/Hemavan, Malå, Niagara and Peterborough), there were a wide array of theories employed including the imagined idyll (Dalarna), peripheries and landscape (Barossa), nation building (Nunavut), the Beyond the Periphery model (Katherine), and community economic development (Terrace Bay). In reading the different theoretical perspectives utilized across space and place, we can see the generation of a richer and more critically nuanced picture of the characteristics, challenges and opportunities for rural tourism in general, as well as across the differentiated geographies. We are pleased with the outcome, and would advocate for similar structures for edited volumes in other segments of tourism scholarship.

Notes

¹ While Nunavut also has a resource-based economy, tourism has not been sought because of crisis but as part of their economic diversity strategy

² Some Sami tourism products exist in the mountain areas of Dalarna; however, like in the case of Tärnaby/Hemavan, Sami culture is a minor component of the destination product centred around the ski resorts.

References

- Åberg, K. G. (2017). *“Anyone could do that”: Nordic perspectives on competence in tourism*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Geography and Economic History, Umeå University. <http://umu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1144705/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Andrereck, K., Valentine, M., Knopf, R., & Vogt, C. (2005). Residents’ perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.03.001>.
- Bell, D. (2006). Variations on the rural idyll. In P. Cloke, T. Marsden, & P. Mooney (Eds.), *Handbook of rural studies* (pp. 149–161). London: Sage.
- Brouder, P., Clave, S., & Ioannides, D. (2017). *Tourism destination evolution*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bryant, C. (1992). Community development and changing rural employment in Canada. In I. Bowler, C. Bryant, & M. Nellis (Eds.), *Contemporary rural systems in transitions volume II: Economy and society* (pp. 265–278). UK: CAB International.
- Butler, R. (1980). The concept of tourism area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *The Canadian Geographer*, 24, 5–12.
- Butler, R. (2015). The evolution of tourism and tourism research. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 49(1): 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2015.1007632>.
- Butler, R., & Hinch, T. (Eds.). (2007). *Tourism and indigenous peoples: Issues and implications*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

- Carson, D. A., & Carson, D. B. (2011). Why tourism may not be everybody's business: The challenge of tradition in resource peripheries. *The Rangeland Journal*, 33(4), 373–383.
- Carson, D. A., Carson, D. B., & Eimermann, M. (2018). International winter tourism entrepreneurs in northern Sweden: Understanding migration, lifestyle, and business motivations. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 18(2), 183–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2017.1339503>.
- Carson, D. A., Carson, D. B., & Hodge, H. (2014). Understanding local innovation systems in peripheral tourism destinations. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(3), 457–473.
- Carson, D. A., & Koster, R. L. (2015). Theoretical perspectives on rural tourism development. In K. Bricker & H. Donohoe (Eds.), *Demystifying theories in tourism* (pp. 46–63). Wallingford: CABI.
- Carson, D. B., Ensign, P., Rasmussen, R., & Taylor, A. (2011). Perspectives on 'demography at the edge'. In D. B. Carson, R. O. Rasmussen, P. Ensign, L. Huskey, & A. Taylor (Eds.), *Demography at the edge: Remote human populations in developed nations* (pp. 3–20). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Coates, K., & Morrison, W. (1992). *The forgotten North: A history of Canada's provincial Norths*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.
- Cornell, S. (2006). *Indigenous peoples, poverty and self-determination in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States*. Cambridge, United States: Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development.
- Dredge, D. (2005). Local versus state-driven production of 'The Region': Regional tourism policy in the Hunter, New South Wales, Australia. In A. Rainnie & M. Grobbelaar (Eds.), *New regionalism in Australia* (pp. 299–319). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Duarte Alonso, A., & Liu, Y. (2013). Local community, volunteering and tourism development: The case of the Blackwood River Valley, Western Australia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2011.644770>.
- Fleischer, A., & Felsenstein, D. (2000). Support for rural tourism: Does it make a difference? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 1007–1024.
- Flognfeldt, T. (2005). The tourist route system—models of travelling patterns. *Revue Belge de Géographie*, 1–2, 35–58.
- Fullagar, S., Markwell, K., & Wilson, E. (Eds.). (2012). *Slow tourism: Experiences and mobilities*. Buffalo: Channel View Publications.
- Fullerton, C. (2015). Arts, culture, and rural community economic development: A Southern Saskatchewan case study. In K. Vodden, R. Gibson, & G. Baldacchino (Eds.), *Place peripheral: The challenge and promise of place-based development in rural and remote regions* (pp. 180–210). St. John's, NL: ISER Books.
- Franklin, A., & Crang, M. (2001). The trouble with tourism and travel theory? *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), 5–22.
- Freitag, T. (1994). Enclave tourism development: For whom the benefits roll? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 538–554.
- Freudenburg, W. R. (1992). Addictive economies: Extractive industries and vulnerable localities in a changing world economy. *Rural Sociology*, 57, 305–322.
- Frisvoll, S. (2013). Conceptualising authentication of ruralness. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 272–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.07.006>.
- George, E. W., Mair, H., & Reid, D. G. (2009). *Rural tourism development: Localism and cultural change*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Hall, C. M. (2005). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. Harlow: Pearson.

- Hall, C. M. (2007). North-South perspectives on tourism, regional development and peripheral areas. In D. K. Müller & B. Jansson (Eds.), *Tourism in peripheries: Perspectives from the Far North and South* (pp. 19–37). Oxfordshire: Cabi.
- Hall, C. M. (2008). *Tourism planning: Policies, processes and relationships* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Pearson.
- Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2014). *The geography of tourism and recreation: Environment, place and space* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hall, D., Kirkpatrick, I., & Mitchell, M. (2005). *Rural tourism and sustainable business*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Halpern, N. (2008). Lapland's airports: Facilitating the development of international tourism in a peripheral region. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 8(1), 25–47.
- Hedlund, M., & Lundholm, E. (2015). Restructuring of rural Sweden—Employment transition and out-migration of three cohorts born 1945–1980. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 42, 123–132.
- Holyoak, N., Carson, D., & Schmallegger, D. (2009). VRUM™: A tool for modelling travel patterns of self-drive tourists. In W. Hoepken, U. Gretzel, & R. Law (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2009* (pp. 238–247). Vienna-New York: Springer.
- Johnston, M. E., Viken, A., & Dawson, J. (2012). Firsts and lasts in Arctic tourism: Last chance tourism and the dialectic of change. In R.H. Lemelin, E. Stewart, & J. Dawson (Eds.), *Last-chance tourism: Adapting tourism opportunities in a changing world* (pp. 10–24). London: Routledge.
- Keller, C. P. (1987). Stages of peripheral tourism development: Canada's Northwest Territories. *Tourism Management*, 8, 20–32.
- Koster, R. L. (2008). Mural-based tourism as a strategy for rural community economic development. In A. Woodside (Ed.), *Advances in culture, tourism and hospitality research* (Vol. 2, pp. 153–292). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Koster, R. L., Lemelin, R. H., & Agnew, K. (2010). Frolicking in the fringe: An assessment of the state of exurban tourism in Canada. In K. Beesley (Ed.), *Rural-urban fringe in Canada: Conflict and controversy* (pp. 144–157). Brandon: Rural Development Institute, Brandon University.
- Koster, R. L. & Randall, J. E. (2005) Images of community economic development: Mural-based tourism as an indicator. *Canadian Geographer*, 49(1): 42–61.
- Lane, B. (1994). What is rural tourism? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1–2), 7–21.
- Laws, E., & Scott, N. (2003). Developing new tourism services: Dinosaurs, a new drive tourism resource for remote regions? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(4), 368–380.
- Leiper, N. (1990). Tourist attraction systems. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 367–384.
- Lemelin, H., Dawson, J., Stewart, E. J., Maher, P., & Lueck, M. (2010). Last-chance tourism: The boom, doom, and gloom of visiting vanishing destinations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(5), 477–493.
- Lew, A., & McKercher, B. (2006). Modeling tourist movements: A local destination analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 403–423.
- Lundgren, J. (1982). The tourist frontier of Nouveau Quebec: Functions and regional linkages. *The Tourist Review*, 37(2), 10–16.
- Mair, H. (2006). Global restructuring and local responses: Investigating rural tourism policy in two Canadian communities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(1):1–45.
- Martinez, D. (2012). Wrong directions and new maps of voice, representation, and engagement: Theorizing cultural tourism, indigenous commodities, and the intelligence of participation. *American Indian Quarterly*, 36(4), 545–573.

- Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27, 391–411.
- Mitchell, C. J. A., & Shannon, M. (2018). Exploring cultural heritage tourism in rural Newfoundland through the lens of the evolutionary economic geographer. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 59, 21–34.
- Monterrubioa, C., Osorioa, M., & Benítez, J. (2018). Comparing enclave tourism's socioeconomic impacts: A dependency theory approach to three state-planned resorts in Mexico. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 8, 412–422.
- Müller, D. K., & Jansson, B. (2007). The difficult business of making pleasure peripheries prosperous: Perspectives on space, place and environment. In D. K. Müller & B. Jansson (Eds.), *Tourism in peripheries: Perspectives from the Far North and South* (pp. 3–18). Oxfordshire: Cabi.
- Müller, D. K. (2011a). Tourism development in Europe's "last wilderness": An assessment of nature-based tourism in Swedish Lapland. In A. A. Grenier & D. K. Müller (Eds.), *Polar tourism: A tool for regional development* (pp. 129–153). Montreal: Presses de l'Université du Québec.
- Müller, D. K. (2011b). Second homes in rural areas: Reflections on a troubled history. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift—Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 65(3), 137–143.
- Müller, D. K. (2016). On the location of tourism: An outlook from Europe's northern periphery. In M. Mayer & H. Job (Eds.), *Naturtourismus: Chancen und Herausforderungen*, 47. *Jahrestagung des Arbeitskreises für Tourismusforschung in der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Geographie* (pp. 113–124), Zwiesel, 25–27 May. Mannheim: Meta GIS Systems.
- Naidoo, P. & Pearce, P. (2018). Enclave tourism versus agritourism: The economic debate. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(17): 1946–1965.
- Naidoo, P., & Sharpley, R. (2016). Local perceptions of the relative contributions of enclave tourism and agritourism to community well-being: The case of Mauritius. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 5(1), 16–25.
- Nepal, S. (2005). Tourism and remote mountain settlements: Spatial and temporal development of tourist infrastructure in the Mt Everest region. *Nepal. Tourism Geographies*, 7(2), 205–227.
- Notzke, C. (2006). *The stranger, the native and the land: Perspectives on indigenous tourism*. Captus Press.
- Pearce, D. G., & Butler, R. (2010). Tourism research: A 20–20 vision. In D. G. Pearce & R. W. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism research: Critiques and challenges* (pp. 229–238). London: Routledge.
- Petrzelka, P., Krannich, R., Brehm, J., & Koons, C. (2005). Rural tourism and gendered nuances. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4):1121–1137.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.04.007>.
- Prideaux, B. (2002a). Building visitor attractions in peripheral areas: Can uniqueness overcome isolation to produce viability? *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(5), 379–389.
- Prideaux, B. (2002b). Creating rural heritage visitor attractions—The Queensland Heritage trails project. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4, 313–323.
- Ray, A. (2010). *Canada's native people: I have lived here since the world began*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.
- Ramsey, D., & Malcolm, C. D. (2017). *The importance of location and scale in rural and small town tourism product development: The case of the Canadian Fossil Discovery Centre*. Manitoba, Canada: The Canadian Geographer.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12409>.

- Reed, M. G. (2003). *Taking stands: Gender and the sustainability of rural communities*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Reid, D. (2003). *Tourism, globalization and development: Responsible tourism planning*. London: Pluto Press.
- Saarinen, J. (2016). Enclave tourism. In J. Jafari, & H. Xiao (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of tourism* (pp. 300–301). New Year: Springer.
- Saxena, G., Clark, G., Oliver, T., & Ilbery, B. (2007). Conceptualizing integrated rural tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 9(4), 347–370.
- Saxena, G., & Ilbery, B. (2008). Integrated rural tourism: A border case study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(1), 233–254.
- Saxena, G., & Ilbery, B. (2010). Developing integrated rural tourism: Actor practices in the English/Welsh border. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26, 260–271.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2009.12.001>.
- Schmallegger, D., & Carson, D. (2010). Is tourism just another staple? A new perspective on tourism in remote regions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(3), 201–221.
- Schmallegger, D., Carson, D., & Tremblay, P. (2010). The economic geography of remote tourism: The problem of connection-seeking. *Tourism Analysis*, 15(1), 125–137.
- Shaw, G., & Williams, A. M. (1994). *Critical issues in tourism: A geographical perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stern, P., & Hall, P. (2010). The proposal economy. *Critique of Anthropology*, 30(3), 243–264.
- Sznajder, M. (Ed.). (2017). *Metropolitan commuter belt tourism*. Routledge.
- Taylor, A. (2016). Introduction: Settlements at the edge. In A. Taylor, D. B. Carson, P. C. Ensign, R. Rasmussen, L. Huskey, & G. Saxinger (Eds.), *Settlements at the edge: Remote human settlements in developed nations* (pp. 3–24). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Vuin, A., Carson, D. A., Carson, D. B., & Garrett, J. (2016). The role of heritage tourism in attracting “active” in-migrants to “low amenity” rural areas. *Rural Society*, 25(2), 134–153.
- Weaver, D. (2005). The distinctive dynamics of exurban tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 7(1), 23–33.
- Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 439–458.
- Whyte, R., & Prideaux, B. (2007). Impacts of low-cost carriers on regional tourism. In I. McDonnell, S. Grabowski & R. March (Eds.), *Tourism—Past Achievements, Future Challenges: Proceedings of the 17th Annual CAUTHE Conference*, 11–14 February. Sydney: University of Technology Sydney.
- Wilson, S., Fesenmaier, D., Fesenmaier, J., & Van Es, J. (2001). Factors for success in rural tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40, 132–138.
- Woznicka, I., Koster, R. L., & Lemelin, R. H. (2010). Communities in transition: Changing views on tourism development as a vehicle for economic diversification in Northern Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 5(1&2), 90–102.