



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Loosing it: Knowledge Management in Tourism Development Projects

Clarke, Alan and Raffay, Agnes and Wiltshier, Peter

University of Pannonia, University of Pannonia, University of Derby

7 July 2009

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/25438/>

MPRA Paper No. 25438, posted 28 Sep 2010 02:52 UTC

LOSING IT: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Alan Clarke

University of Pannonia

Ágnes Raffay

University of Pannonia

Peter Wiltshier

University of Derby

Knowledge management and the development of the destination's capacity of the intellectual skills needed to use tourism as an effective tool in the search for regeneration and development are central themes explored within this paper. The authors have lived and worked with the problems inherent in short term funding of special projects designed to achieve or facilitate tourism development. We have witnessed with growing sadness the results – and the lack of them – as funding cycles end and staff with experience move away. Development processes require multi-stakeholder involvement at all levels, bringing together governments, NGOs, residents, industry and professionals in a partnership that determines the amount and kind of tourism that a community wants (Sirakaya et al., 2001). Planners need to provide knowledge sharing mechanisms to residents, visitors, industry and other stakeholders in order to raise public and political awareness. We note an absence of literature relating to the capacity of communities to learn from short-term funded projects that inherently are destined to provide a strategic blueprint for destination development and in most cases regeneration through community-based tourism action.

Keywords: Knowledge management, sharing and embedding, community tourism

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents an argument about the importance of knowledge management (KM) and knowledge sharing that the authors have been



discussing, in various contexts, for over three years. The authors have lived and worked with the problems inherent in short term funding of special projects designed to achieve or facilitate tourism development. We have witnessed with growing sadness the results – and the lack of them – as funding cycles end and staff with experience move away. Development processes require multi-stakeholder involvement at all levels, bringing together governments, NGOs, residents, industry and professionals in a partnership that determines the amount and kind of tourism that a community wants (Sirakaya et al., 2001). The authors' perceptions concern the knowledge accumulated in both explicit and tacit forms, and the ways in which that knowledge can and could be embedded to facilitate improved formal and informal communication within communities. This construction of social capital has typically been seen as a task for communities through political and social reform. Unfortunately, as has been observed elsewhere (Putnam, 1995; Roberts, 2004) this democratic and public social capital accumulation is neither created or shaped by public policy (Fukuyama, 1999)

The coordination between knowledge management and social capital (SC) is produced informally and exists as leverage for additional capital in modern economies, and arguably becomes more important as the nature of tourism economic activity becomes more complex and technologically sophisticated. These complex functions in KM and SC accumulation are both costly to monitor and better controlled through some form of quality management KM systems than through formal public sector management. We argue that tourism planners need to provide knowledge sharing mechanisms to residents, visitors, industry and other stakeholders in order to raise public and political awareness.

We draw examples from work we have been directly involved in, using the tourism development of a market town in the United Kingdom as our main test case. However we will also draw upon the experience of two multi-country, multi-agency projects: one targeted at developing urban tourism, DETOUR (Clarke and Raffay, 2002), and the second designed to enhance the uptake of heritage and cultural tourism throughout Europe, Heritour, to establish parallels that rule out arguments of scale.

LITERATURE REVIEW

We wish to elaborate an analysis informed by key developments in sustainable community tourism (Choi and Sirakaya, 2006), stakeholder theory (Raffay, 2007; Clarke and Raffay, 2007; Clarke and Raffay, 2008)

and network analysis (Cooper, 2006; Scott et al., 2008; Lazzeretti and Petrillo, 2006; Michael, 2007). In their review of the literature to underpin what they call sustainable community tourism (SCT), Choi and Sirakaya (2006) argue that sustainable development should aim to improve the residents' quality of life by optimising local economic benefits, by protecting the natural and built environment and provide a high quality experience for visitors (Bramwell and Lane, 1993; Hall and Lew, 1998; McIntyre, 1993; Stabler, 1997; UNCED, 1992). Traditionally, tourism development contains economic, social or socio-cultural and environmental dimensions (Mowforth and Munt, 1998). However, recent debates suggest that SCT development involves even more dimensions. SCT is "comprised of ecological, social, economic, institutional/ political, cultural and technological dimensions at the international, national, regional and local community levels, and within agriculture, tourism, political sciences, economics and ecology (Bossell, 1999; Mowforth and Munt, 1998). These dimensions of SCT are interdependent and mutually reinforcing (Colby, 1989; Reid, 1995; Slocombe, 1993)." (Choi and Sirakaya, 2006:1275) In short, they offer the following summary: "a holistic approach to sustainable tourism development should be ecologically responsible, socially compatible, culturally appropriate, politically equitable, technologically supportive and, finally, economically viable for the host community." (Choi and Sirakaya, 2006:1276) A holistic approach to sustainable tourism development should be (Lorincz, Raffay and Clarke, 2007)

- **Responsive**
- **Ecologically responsible**
- **Socially compatible**
- **Politically equitable**
- **Economically viable**
- **Culturally appropriate**
- **Technologically supportive**

and we would argue have to ensure that knowledge transfers occur.

Davenport and Prusak (1998: 5) describe knowledge as a "fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, an expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information". Its origin is the human mind and according to Polányi (1966), recalling and capturing it is not that straightforward because we know more than we can tell, this is tacit knowledge. While explicit knowledge, the "know-what" is usually collected in written format, tacit knowledge, the "know-how" is needed to put the "know-what" into practice. Tacit knowledge is built upon experiences and is

subjective while explicit knowledge can be seen as objective. When people leave only that part of their knowledge which has been made explicit remains but the ability to use the acquired knowledge disappears. To prevent this organisations that realise the importance of this intangible asset create knowledge sharing circumstances with the help of a systematically and consciously organised knowledge management system.

The knowledge sharing process is successful when the source is transferred to the recipient who can and will reuse it by recreating the knowledge elements. The measurable valid success is when the recipient internalises the received knowledge that is “obtaining ownership of, commitment to and satisfaction with the transferred knowledge”. Cummings and Teng (2003, 2006) investigated five primary contexts that affect knowledge internalisation:

- *Relational context* they mean those factors that generate distances between the participants such as: organisational-, physical-, institutional-, knowledge-, and relationship distance. *Organisational distance* implies the methods through which transfer is governed; *physical distance* refers to the actual propinquity of the parties; *institutional distance* indicates the similarities between an individual's and the organisational values; *knowledge distance* shows the different knowledge base the source and the recipient have while *relationship distance* refers to the social and strategic similarities of the quality of the experience that the two parties create.

- *Knowledge context* alludes to the knowledge transferred and has two features, *knowledge explicitness* and *knowledge embeddedness*. The former is related to the degree to which knowledge is verbalised while the latter refers to deep-rooted knowledge in people, tools, tasks, routines, sub-networks or products and technology.

- *Recipient context* which includes a number of elements such as recipient's motivation, absorptive and learning aptitude, willingness, knowledge and collaborative experience, retentiveness and learning culture. Regarding successful knowledge sharing recipient's accepting, retaining and fostering new knowledge competences are key factors.

- *Source context* is a vital part affecting the success of knowledge sharing because credible knowledge sharing activity improves the recipient's learning and helps those with less capacity to learn more effectively.

- *Environmental context* both national and international business environmental factors, such as economy, culture, politics, institutional and technological environment are taken into account.

The appropriate synthesis of the five factors impinges on successful knowledge transfer. In addition according to one of the findings of the Siemens *Knowledge Management Case Book* (Davenport and Probst, 2002) the success of global knowledge sharing lies in a healthy mixture of four interrelated areas: cognitive knowledge (the “know-what”), skills (the “know-how”), systems understanding (the “know-why”) and self-motivated creativity (the “care-why”) along with the proper leadership support, organisation structure, motivation and reward system and organisational culture.

Successful knowledge management methods rest on the notion of communities of practice, where the members of the communities exchange knowledge informally and develop a single identity, shared values and knowledge through problem solving, mutual work and everyday interactions. The members of the communities exchange knowledge informally and develop a single identity, shared values and knowledge through problem solving, mutual work and everyday interactions. In an organisation there are visible communities of practice and some that are not easily detectible since the members keep changing. Internalised knowledge is exchanged directly and implicit knowledge is embedded in everyday performance that is always linked to a specific context. Formal communities of practice tend to have moderators whose responsibility is to direct the community towards achievements. In the Siemens case study the experiences and findings of successfully working communities of practice are summarised in eight points (Davenport and Probst 2002:122-123):

- an information platform must be centrally available and well structured
- well-skilled moderators play a vital role
- the activities of moderators, the information and communication platform are properly funded
- limits of communities and the need for additional support are recognised
- additional incentives are not required
- consistent internal promotion is necessary
- the definition of ‘Community of Practice activities’ is flexible
- the need to foster and maintain strong personal relationships.

While Siemens demonstrates that there are consciously developed communities of practice, other organisations might not even be aware of their presence, or if they exist the terms used to describe them will differ. These communities generate extraordinary learning and they play an enormous role in the structure and development of organisations.

Applying these theoretical principles and observations from other academic fields to tourism development requires a focus on destination development. Svensson et al (2005:32) argued that five assumptions could be identified that informed studies of tourist destinations and their development process. They summarised them as: “

- a) There is a multi-actor complexity of the destination that needs to be taken into account.
- b) It is also likely that certain resource dependencies between the actors involved are important dynamic factors of the process and need to be understood.
- c) The public-private dimension of the destination may be important; i.e. the role of government vis-à-vis firms needs to be taken into account.
- d) Who is in control and the leadership aspect are open issues in destination development
- e) Destination development is a process with low predictability in regard to outcomes.”

This demonstrates the range of areas in which communities of practice can be constructed and need to operate. It is also useful to note the final point, that development is a process with low predictability. We would argue that building knowledge management into the development processes would help to render destination development more predictable.

Within the literature, communities of practice can be seen to have much in common with networks, clusters and collaboration. Gray identified a series of phases through which collaboration was formed. From the perspectives of stakeholder theory and of the modern power theories, *Phase one: Problem setting* is the most crucial. This is the stage where the desire to collaborate is expressed, and where the legitimate stakeholders are identified. Stakeholders in collaboration theory are defined as including “all individuals, groups or organisations that are directly influenced by actions others take to solve the problem.” (Gray, 1989:5) A problem arises with this definition as it looks at certain aspects of the issue and but fails to consider some others. For example, the above definition of stakeholders stresses the ‘affected by’ element of the stakeholder approach rather than the ‘interested in’ factor, which seems to form an at least as important if not more important part of most stakeholder definitions (Freeman, 1984; Hill and Jones, 1992; Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Carroll, 1996). However, this may be Gray’s way of developing a theory: starting with a basic statement and incorporating new aspects into it with the development of the thought process. She

enriches the definition with the claim that the actors who she regards as stakeholders will also have an interest in a common problem.

As far as stakeholders are concerned, one could argue that if the relevant persons and/or organisations with a stake in the problem are not identified at the beginning, the failure of the collaboration process is most predictable. It is also necessary to examine if the stakeholders participating in the process represent the affected stakeholders adequately (Boiko et al., 1996). If the collaborating stakeholders do not represent all the affected stakeholders, some needs and interests may not be expressed and therefore, related alternatives might be ignored. It can also lead to the excluded stakeholders rejecting the proposals. (Gregory and Keeney, 1994)

In the first phase, a diverse set of stakeholders will be identified, with the expectation that they all hold some but not all of the necessary resources. Stakeholders enter the collaboration process not only with different resources but also with a varying degree of power, therefore are likely to have different expectations as to what the outcome of the collaboration should be. "Each stakeholder has a unique appreciation of the problem." (Gray, 1989:5)

As one of Gray's more elaborate definitions suggests, collaboration is about shared responsibility and shared power, therefore stakeholders have to learn 'strategies of mutual empowerment' (1989:271). This definition shows more than healthy optimism: real-life examples will not be likely to testify sharing power. Nevertheless, she recognises that if power imbalances are perceived by the would-be collaborative partners, collaboration may not take place at all. "There may be circumstances in which stakeholders are unable or unwilling to engage each other in this way. [...] When one party has unchallenged power to influence the domain, collaboration does not make sense." (Gray, 1989:24) Clegg and Hardy claim that a different scenario may also arise from power imbalances, where collaboration is achieved in rhetoric but nothing indicates 'shared power' or 'mutual empowerment'. "We cannot ignore that power can be hidden behind the façade of "trust" and the rhetoric of "collaboration", and used to promote vested interest through the manipulation of and capitulation by weaker partners" (Clegg and Hardy, 1996:678). Reed (1997:567) argues that "While power relations are included within collaborative theory, it is frequently assumed that collaboration can overcome power imbalances by involving all stakeholders in a process that meets their needs." Bramwell and Sharman (1999:394) suggest that Reed firmly believes "such power differences

among stakeholders actually are so embedded in society that they always affect the nature of the collaboration”.

Phase 2: Direction setting is the stage in the collaboration process, where the ground rules are established, an agenda is agreed and agreements are reached. The decisions made in this phase reveal whether the relevant stakeholders have been identified and the potential power imbalances between them have been dealt with. If the agenda features actions that seem to favour the interests of dominant groups and/or ignore those of others with a less significant voice it can be assumed that the relative power of the stakeholder groups has not been neutralised (Getz and Timur, 2005).

Although *Phase 3: Implementation* is an integral part of the collaboration process, it is usually overseen. Case studies (Sweeting, 2006) in general do not offer an insight into how the decisions made during the collaborative process are implemented, or even into what happens to the collaboration at all after its organisational structure has been established.

Even if one phase of the process enjoys more attention than others, nobody should argue the usefulness of collaboration as an aid to development processes. However, only if all relevant stakeholders, adequately representing all affected and interested stakeholders are identified as collaborative partners, and there are no major power-imbalances between the actors, will the benefits of collaboration be available for all concerned to enjoy. These benefits, according to Gray, are the following:

- The process ensures that each stakeholder’s interests are considered in any agreement
- Parties most familiar with the problem invent their solutions
- Participation enhances acceptance of solution and willingness to implement it
- Relations between the stakeholders improve
- Mechanisms for coordinating future actions among the stakeholders can be established (1989:21)

We are concerned that during the processes of tourism development, knowledge stocks (the things that are known) should be shared within community networks. Knowledge sharing assumes a knowledge community and we will explore how the creation of such a community sometimes fails. We will demonstrate the tendency to leave project work to the project workers, maintaining discrete and separate stocks of knowledge which result in a failure to embed the knowledge in any sustainable form within the community. In order to do this we will draw

on the experiences of two European funded projects and explore how the projects could have embedded themselves into the tourism communities.

DISCUSSION

The first project was known as DETOUR and was funded through the ECOS-OUVERTURE scheme using ERDF and PHARE contributions to a total of €797,176. Officially known as 'Compact Cities and Tourism - Developing Tourism in Urban Europe' this project was aimed at producing Regional Development Strategies, developing specific local potential and the creation of lasting jobs. It began in January, 1999 and ended on the 30th of June, 2001. The project was led by a Steering Group from Derby City Partnership, including the Southern Derbyshire Chamber of Commerce, Derby City Council and the University of Derby. This project

(http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/innovation/innovating/ecos/detour.pdf) brought together six compact cities from across Europe to develop strategic approaches to urban tourism: Ghent, Kaunas, Maribor, Patras and Veszprém joined Derby. The main objective of the project was to develop a Tourism Strategy model that could be used by the participating cities to develop, review or refine their own strategies, and could also be applied in other cities. The model was developed through sharing professional expertise and experience at a series of workshops in the six cities. Programmes for visitor care and tourism management were also developed at the workshops to help establish best practice guidelines for urban tourism in Europe.

The partnership began with a Seminar and Evaluation week in Derby where delegates interested in tourism, economic development and city promotion met to look at Derby's tourism product and that of the wider region. A review of the city's tourism strategy had been produced and discussions on best practice guidelines were initiated. Seminar and evaluation weeks were then held in each of the other partner cities to review their tourism product, current developments and future potential. During these weeks, delegates also explored the nature and strengths of the partnerships involving public and private sector and the universities in the respective cities. A second round of workshops then took place in each city. In Derby, the development and implementation of the Derby Diplomat customer care programme for front-line staff was the main theme. This was demonstrated and then explored in terms of potential roll-out to each of the other partners. The workshop in Ghent was focused on partnerships, taking examples of best practice from each city. In

Patras, an outline Tourism Strategy for Compact Cities was drawn up. During the final three workshops in Maribor, Kaunas and Veszprém, this outline strategy was used to help establish or refine the Tourism Strategy for that city. A further workshop was held in Gent during which a reference manual was drawn up, designed to establish a base level of tourism data required by any city to underpin their strategic development.

Another project which had a somewhat similar agenda within a different context was The HERITOUR project which was co-funded by the European Community within the INTERREG IIB CADSES programme. HERITOUR was designed to protect cultural heritage in rural areas through sustainable development. To achieve the project goal during the implementation the project developed cultural thematic routes both at regional and trans-national level. The project also included product development feasibility studies, marketing studies, the creation of a common database and architectural planning guidelines were elaborated. The project originated in a small village called Kislód in Hungary. There were 14 partners (10 financed and 4 with observer status) involved in this project: 3 Greek, 2 Italian, 1 Slovakian, 5 Hungarian, 1 Czech and 2 Romanian. The project ran from July, 2005 to the 31st of December, 2007, with a total budget allocation of € 2,205,600 (<http://project.heritour.com/>). The project's main objective was the protection, thematic organisation and promotion of local cultural heritage in remote/rural/mountainous/border areas by creating regional and transnational cultural routes. This objective is intended to be reached by carrying out the following main activities:

- Assessment of local cultural heritage
- Elaboration of feasibility studies and marketing strategies on possible transnational thematic routes and on the necessary investments
- Architectural planning activities for investment (cultural heritage included in the thematic route where protection was needed, tourist access infrastructure)
- Implementation of marketing tools suggested by the transnational marketing strategy.

The project's long term objective was the preservation of local cultural heritage in European villages, and the economic development of rural areas of the EU by assessing and developing their local cultural values into tourist attractions, providing a good basis for the further development of rural tourism. The project aimed at involving local communities in defining, mapping and caring for what they considered important about their local cultural landscapes and what they saw

contributing to the perception of regional identity and a sense of place. The project also helped to change the attitude of the local people towards their own values, “giving them back” their history in the long term, becoming a part of European culture that is characterized by the diversity of cultures. The project contributed to transnational economic development and social cohesion due to many partners involved at local and regional level both within the preparation phase and later on during the implementation and marketing phase.

As a result of the project the cultural values of the participating regions have been assessed, and with common work, methodology, feasibility studies and marketing strategy thematic cultural routes have been developed. As the attractions of the target regions are rather at local dimensions more thematic routes (approximately 4 or 5, for example: religious, industrial, handcrafts etc.) will be developed per region, focusing on the involved partner's similarities in a broader sense, in order to create transnational thematic routes too. Taking into consideration the rural nature of the target areas the routes mainly organised in villages are linked to a town within each region, in order to attract tourists arriving there, mobilizing them to visit the rural areas. After the project finalisation the thematic routes are being promoted with common marketing tools to tourists (common website, image, signs).

What we see in these examples are two projects which were viewed as successful by the participants and the funders. However we would urge a reconsideration of the projects from a knowledge management and from a social capital accumulation perspective. The initial successes look less convincing. The participants clearly bought into the processes of strategy formation and stakeholder inclusion during the projects and went away enthusiastically advocating the benefits of inclusive, partnership working. The projects have both developed capacity, in deed we could claim that the projects addressed this both at an individual level and at a community level with some success. We have evidence of training workshops that clearly had positive outcomes. The communities too, in the HERITOUR project, expressed a stronger sense of identity and recognition of their cultural heritage. These gains were very important and are valuable outcomes, correctly valued by the organisers and the funders.

The longer period of hindsight that is possible with the DETOUR project clearly demonstrates that there are issues which the project was not designed to address and which are beyond the scope of these sorts of developmental projects. These projects are ‘good news’ for the organisers and local communities as they bring with them levels of funding and opportunities which were previously not there. There is a sense in which

the attention brought with the money and the space to think through and enact development is a luxury not usually experienced in tourism development. Even some of the professional tourism workers were dubious about taking time away from their posts in order to take part in the programme of study visits. Private sector representatives, especially from SMEs, made valid calls about the loss of earnings and opportunities which were the – hidden – costs of participation. The bonuses from participation did not emerge immediately in the short term cash flows of their businesses to offset this sense of disruption. What we have seen in the intervening period is a huge turnover of people working in and managing the tourism operations in the six cities. If we are brave, we can say that this has contributed to the dissemination of the best practice models and creative thinking the project engendered. But if we look at it from the cities and from the cities' points of view, then we can see that the project has left them behind. In only one city is there still a DETOUR project participant directly involved in the development of the city's tourism strategy – and she is one of the authors of this paper!

CONCLUSION

We would urge projects to look for more than individual and community capacity building in their actions. The idea of community of practice is beneficial here with the need for knowledge to be shared before it can properly be evaluated. The content of the projects has been of a very high standard but the process by which they are embedded has not been as consistent or as thorough. One problem emerges from the very success of the projects in attracting monies which can be used for development and the opportunities these create for employment. Given the nature of the funding and of the projects these appointments are by their very nature of a fixed term and often the people working on the project are the ones most committed to the development and to its processes. This is almost inevitable as the project champions mainly come from within the project, as they have the direct experience of the benefits and the enthusiasm which comes from participating in a successful initiative which gathers its own momentum. More painfully the processes are doubly challenged, as when the funding ends it is those core members who have spent most time on the projects and therefore received the most of the funding who find themselves most challenged and very often without a job (or, at least, a job which allows them to carry on working in the fields covered by the project funding). This is a direct loss of explicit knowledge but informally it is also often a source of demotivation for

others as they see the key drivers of the project drifting away. This is not a challenge to those people who have been project funded but for the organisations who have accepted the funding. The individual must seek further employment and often has to leave the area in order to find suitable work. It is definitely a challenge to those who apply for project funding and make commitments to long term sustainable development objectives.

We think the tragedy is greater than that suffered by the individual. What we have seen happening has greater effects that spread far wider than the core group, as those outside this inner circle of the project team are often less enthusiastic finding themselves picking up the recurring work that was entailed in the project initiatives. As we all know, websites do not update themselves. As the realisation impacts on the wider group, the workload and prioritisation changes further disrupting those connected to the project. We need to think through how we develop sharing and reflection amongst those who do not form the nucleus of the project. Social capital accumulation and tacit knowledge management cannot be stored and retrieved without a greater involvement in and elaboration of knowledge store and retrieval systems being at the core of the project review and feed forward. The feed forward necessarily involves stakeholder agreement on KM and SC outcomes and outputs being clearly identified, which in turn are firmly embedded in knowledge management software and appropriately filed for the external parties involved in policy and planning to later retrieve (See for example, Hu et al, 2006; Abdullah et al, 2009).

As we have observed the DETOUR project insisted that the city teams were made up of representatives of the private sector, the public sector and the Universities in the cities, which already constructs a challenge. The existing and emergent needs of these three sectors can be very different and there is often no reason – or even willingness – to meet across sector or indeed to think outside of our own vested interests. We have often found that individuals are reluctant to share at the beginning of projects, believing perhaps that knowledge is power but have experienced the joy that comes with exchange and sharing across the community of practice that the project helps to create.

IMPLICATIONS

There are three components to encouraging the public and private partners in tourism development networks embedding the lessons learned from the project work engaged by the authors. The first identified and

related stakeholder theory in practice. Concerns include a lack of credible long-term enthusiasm for collaboration in knowledge management; inequality of resources distributed through the stakeholders in the destination and what has been described by the rhetoric of collaboration (Clegg and Hardy, 1996). The second component relates to informal structures underpinning the current experience of collaboration and embedded knowledge. The final is the irregular storage and retrieval options available to use the accumulated knowledge for the purpose of planning and policy creation in the future.

Our approach to capacity building and project delivery has now moved beyond a simple concern for reviewing what we do and even analyses of why we do the things we do. We are deeply committed to exploring the processes involved in tourism development, sharing the insights that come from an appreciation of and involvement in these and in sharing this capacity with those stakeholders in tourism that ought to be involved in the tourism development of their areas. This can then breathe life into the RESPECT modelling of sustainable community tourism with long term changes built into tourism governance and civil society structures. We see this sharing of knowledge contributing to a deeper embeddedness of the work that has been funded by the project sponsors. It is possible to change the formal structures governing tourism development but it is also necessary to build confidence in the informal processes that shape the local conditions that we have to work with. Our views of effective communities of practice echo the points made by Cummings and Teng (2003, 2006) but we would emphasise that formal systems are not sufficient in themselves to ensure effective and continued sharing of knowledge and capital throughout the stakeholders involved.

Systems have greater fixity than individuals but what we are addressing is a cultural shift about the way we see roles within tourism development. Sharing breaks down compartments and challenges compartmentalised ways of thinking. “We did not ask you because it is not your job” is a statement we have heard all too often and which goes completely against the ideas of effective sharing. Effective knowledge management systems make knowledge available to the widest possible audience and empower those widest audiences with the skills and the confidence to act on what they ‘know’ and therefore contribute to the development processes. With a culture change towards sharing and openness knowledge management becomes a possibility.

We also have observed that another cultural change is actually necessary to make this long term objective realisable. We know it is important for people to think about what they do and the ways in which

they do those tasks. However the task focus also needs challenging to move towards a model where people are concerned with processes themselves. Sharing involves opening up to different aspects of the processes involved and therefore necessarily adds to people's sense of task. What we would argue is that lifting the eyes helps, but refocusing on the processes adds even more to our sense of understanding, involvement and commitment. It is not what we do but why that becomes the question that drives our desire for knowledge. The why question is also about why we have the processes we do and where they have come from and where they are going.

Our experience of collaboration, partnership building and project working has been wonderful but we believe that more can be achieved if we can find a way to embed our developmental processes in a wider and deeper context. We think that the knowledge management framework offers a useful way of considering the challenge of how we can address the embedding of the knowledge and social capital that the projects create and prevent us from losing it completely when individuals, skilled in tourism and regeneration project management, move on.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, R.H., Zamli, K.Z. & Selamat, M.H. (2009). Collaborative Knowledge Management for the Eco-tourism Sector: A Technical Perspective. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, Vol. 9, No.2, pp.409-416.
- Boiko, P.E., Morrill, R.L., Flynn, J., Faustman, E.M., van Belle, G. & Omenn, G.S. (1996). Who holds the stakes? A case study of stakeholder identification at two nuclear weapon production sites. *Risk Analysis*, Vol. 16, No.2, pp.237-249.
- Bossell, H. (1999). *Indicators for Sustainable Development: Theory, methods and applications*. Manitoba, International Institute for Sustainable Development.
- Bramwell, B. & Lane, B. (1993). Sustainable Tourism: an evolving global approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol.1, No.1, pp.1-5.
- Bramwell, B. & Sharman, A. (1999). Collaboration in local tourism policymaking. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 26, No.2, pp.392-415.
- Carroll, A.B. (1996). *Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management*, 3rd edition. Cincinnati, Ohio, South-Western College Publishing.
- Choi, H.C. & Sirakaya E. (2006). Sustainability Indicators for Managing Community Tourism. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27, pp.1274-1289.

- Clarke, A. and Raffay, Á. (2002). Tourism strategy in urban Europe – the DETOUR experience. In N. Andrews, S. Flanagan and J. Ruddy (Eds.) *Tourism Destination Planning*, Dublin: Dublin Institute of Technology.
- Clarke, A. and Raffay, Á. (2007). Understanding Stakeholder Relations in Urban Tourism Management In P. Long (Eds.) *Researching Destination Management, Policy and Planning: linking culture, heritage and tourism*, Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University Press.
- Clarke, A. & Raffay, Á. (2008). Stakeholder Relationships and Sustainable Tourism Partnerships: power, identity and sustainability. A paper presented to the Attractions and Events as Catalysts for Regeneration and Social Change Conference at The University of Nottingham 24th and 25th September 2008.
- Clegg, S.R. and Hardy, C. (1996). Conclusion: Representations. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy and W.R. Nord (Eds.) *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 676-708), Sage: London.
- Colby, M. (1989). *The Evolution of Paradigms of Environmental Management in Development*. World Bank Strategic Planning and Review Discussion Papers No 1. Washington DC, World Bank.
- Cooper, C. (2006). Knowledge management and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 33, No.1, pp.47-64.
- Cummings, J.L. & Teng, B. (2003). Transferring R&D Knowledge: The Key Factors Affecting Knowledge Transfer Success. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, Vol. 20, No.1-2, pp.39-68.
- Cummings, J.L. & Teng, B. (2006). The Keys to Successful Knowledge-sharing. *Journal of Genera Management*, Vol. 31, No.4, pp.1-18.
- Davenport, T.H. & Probst, G.J.B. (2002). *Knowledge Management Case Book: Siemens Best Practises*. London, John Wiley.
- Davenport, T.H. & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working Knowledge: how organizations manage what they know*. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Donaldson, T. & Preston, L.E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence and Implications. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, pp.65-91.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston, Pitman.
- Fukuyama, F. (1999). Social Capital and Civil Society. IMF Conference on Second Generation Reforms.
- Getz, D. & Timur, S. (2005). Stakeholder involvement in sustainable tourism: balancing the voices. In W.F. Theobald (Eds.) *Global Tourism*, 3rd edition (pp 230-247), London: Elsevier.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding Common Grounds For Multiparty Problems* San Francisco and London, Jossey-Bass.
- Gregory, R. & Keeney, R.L. (1994). Creating policy alternatives using stakeholder values. *Management Science*, Vol. 40, No.8, pp.1035-1048.
- Hall, C.M. & Lew, A.A. (1998). *Sustainable Tourism: Geographical Perspectives* (pp. 1-24). New York, Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.

- Hill, C.W.L. & Jones, T.M. (1992). Stakeholder-agency theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 29, pp.131-154.
- Hu, C., Racherla, P. and Singh, N. (2006). Developing a Knowledge-Based System Using Domain-Specific Ontologies and Experts: The eSAFE Case Study for the Event Management. In M. Hitz, M. Sigala and J. Murphy (Eds.) *Information and Communication technologies in tourism*, Vienna: Springer.
- Lazzeretti, L. & Petrillo, C.S. (2006). *Tourism Local Systems and Networking*. Oxford, Elsevier.
- Lorincz, K., Raffay, Á. and Clarke, A. (2007). Best Practice in Rural Destination Management - Exploring Hungarian Excellence In P. Long (Eds.) *Researching Destination Management, Policy and Planning: linking culture, heritage and tourism*, Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University Press.
- McIntyre, G. (1993). *Sustainable Tourism Development: Guide for Local Planners*. Madrid, World Tourism Organization.
- Michael, E. (2007). *Micro-Clusters and Networks: the growth of tourism*. Oxford, Elsevier.
- Mowforth, A. & Munt, I. (1998). *Tourism and Sustainability: New tourism in the third world*. London, Routledge.
- Polányi, M. (1966). *The Tacit Dimension*. New York, Doubleday.
- Putnam, R.D. (1995). Bowling Alone. America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 6, No.1, pp.65-78.
- Raffay, Á. (2007). Stakeholder involvement in Urban Tourism Development: A Tale of Two Cities. Unpublished PhD thesis University of Derby.
- Reed, M.G. (1997). Power Relations and Community-Based Tourism Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24, pp.566-591.
- Red, D. (1995). *Sustainable Development: An introductory guide*. London, Earthscan Publications
- Roberts, J.M. (2004). What's Social About Social Capital. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 6, No.4, pp.471-493.
- Sirakaya, E., Jamal, T. and Choi, H.S. (2001). Developing tourism indicators for destination sustainability In D.B. Weaver (Eds.) *The encyclopedia of ecotourism* (pp. 411-432), Wallingford: CAB International.
- Scott, N., Baggio, R. & Cooper, C. (2008). *Network Analysis and Tourism*. Clevedon, Channel View Publications.
- Slocombe, D.S. (1993). Environmental planning, ecosystem science and ecosystem approaches for integrating environment and development. *Environmental Management*, Vol. 17, No.3, pp.289-303.
- Stabler, M.J. (1997). *Tourism and Sustainability: Principles to Practice*. Wallingford, CABI.
- Svensson, B., Nordin, S. & Flagestad, A. (2005). A Governance Perspective on Destination Development - exploring partnerships, clusters and innovation systems. *Tourism Review*, Vol. 60, No.2, pp.32-37.
- Sweeting, J. (2006). The Power of Partnerships. *Greenhotelier*, October, pp.12-19.

United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). (1992).
Rio declaration on environment and development. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil,
UNCED.

SUBMITTED: JUNE 2009

REVISION SUBMITTED: AUGUST 2009

ACCEPTED: SEPTEMBER 2009

REFEREED ANONYMOUSLY

Alan Clarke (clarke@turizmus.uni-pannon.hu) , University of Pannonia
Veszprém, Hungary.

Ágnes Raffay (raffay@turizmus.uni-pannon.hu), University of Pannonia
Veszprém, Hungary.

Peter Wiltshier (P.Wiltshier@derby.ac.uk), University of Derby,
Buxton, United Kingdom.