Health and welfare at the boundaries: community development through tourism

Peter Wiltshier

Abstract

Purpose – *Concepts of health and wellbeing have long been conceived as relevant to leisure, recreation and rejuvenation. These are now conceived as being necessary and useful as potential measures of success in community development and in that subset of leisure and recreation pursuits that is designated as tourism at a destination. The paper aims to discuss this issue.*

Design/methodology/approach – *A post-modern approach to development of community and markers of sustainable development more-or-less correspond to sustainable development goals (there are 17) that often overlay the concepts of good health and wellbeing that concern all stakeholders.*

Findings – *This paper encompasses best practice experiences from two case studies conducted in a tourism "hot spot" in the environs of the first National Park established in Derbyshire in the UK. There is some urgency about this topic as resources for community development are increasingly under pressure from local, central government and the expectation is now that local communities take full responsibility for that development. An inter-disciplinary approach using concepts of health and wellbeing is recommended.*

Originality/value – *Wellbeing may demand a greater allocation of scarce resources in an era of self-determination, bottom-up and locally sourced community aspiring to become, or remain, a destination of choice. Two case studies' outcomes in this development are presented with a special focus on creation of a repository for the know-how and know what of the learning acquired.*

Keywords *Development, Wellbeing, Community, Tourism, Destination, Repository*

Paper type *Research paper*

Peter Wiltshier is based at the University of Derby, Derby, UK.

Introduction

Tourism's capital

Before launching into a discussion about the benefits of health and wellbeing to destinations and vice-versa one should ponder the relationship between our stores of knowledge regarding development studies, tourism and communities. First, to assure ourselves that existing and planned development is good for communities before considering for a moment that planned development enhances visitors' experiences. Second, that any development agenda has a legacy of useful new knowledge that can be embedded within the resources and repository of community as a resource for the creation, storage and retrieval of social, political and cultural capital (Altinay *et al.*, 2016; Berkes and Ross, 2013; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Macbeth *et al.*, 2004; Putnam, 2001). A shared concern for community and destination in past years, given that one is delivering to visitors, is that neo-liberal and market-force models, resulting from post-Fordist consumerism and competitive advantage paradigms, have consigned tourism to the margins of national and regional development. In other words, tourism was destined to boost economic productivity (hence boosterism as a working title for one early paradigm) and was scarcely concerned with the viability, strategic planned development and measurement in the community of the outcomes of numbers of visitors travelling away from their normal place of work or residence

for the purpose of recreation, business or entertainment. Perhaps our thoughts of tourism after the Second World War were quite confined to the business of mobility for entrepreneurs' profits and to the hedonism desired by those recovering from global conflict. Our thinking since the oil price shocks of the 1970s, and the widespread adoption of low-cost aviation in the 1980s with deregulated aviation and the degradation of physical environments in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean has been conservation of the physical environment (Brundtland et al., 1987; Quarrie, 1992). It was not simply a matter of overcrowded beaches and cheap hotels and banal inauthentic products and services for tourists; much more the impact of boosterism on the host communities providing a welcome to increasing numbers of tourists. This boosterism had social, cultural and political impacts on hosts as well as environmental impacts on so-called idyllic resorts where hedonism for visitors was at the top of a list of "things to do" (Crick, 1989; Carr, 2002). In the age of integrative policy and planning, where boosterism is certainly not the only way of developing, much more attention is paid to the value and belief in systems that capture inalienable and inimitable values and beliefs of host communities and acknowledging that these repositories have tangible goodwill in social and economic terms.

Enduring social as well as economic returns

So, in the new millennium equity, accessibility and legitimacy drive an upsurge in concerns that developers can overturn socio-economic and environmental protests from residents representing the enduring interest of community. An upsurge in imported diseases was hardly new in the 1970s – mariners in the fifteenth century introduced diseases like syphilis, measles and influenza, almost with impunity, to host communities for 500 years. Hosts believed that independence from colonial hegemonic influences would wane in the second-half of the twentieth century. Unfortunately, the dominance of the post-Fordist tourism business determined very much the economic and environmental focus of the tourism enterprises until the end of that century (Tisdell, 2000; Dwyer et al., 2010). Tourists contracted with big business to purchase and revel in resort-style enclave accommodation, entertainment and attractions in many countries that struggled to provide their own hosts with the lifestyle and quality of existence that were undoubtedly enjoyed by the tourists. The tourists were, and still are, arriving aboard wide-bodied aircraft to enjoy experiences in resorts where the profits were repatriated to the visitors' own countries along with the departing holidaymakers. Thus hosts' lifestyles, values and social, political and cultural wealth was scarcely improving during the post-war era (Vanhove, 1997; Rojek, 2000). The big players in tourism in that period were not even reinvesting in socio-cultural returns for the hosts in Spain, France, Italy, Greece and the Caribbean never mind emerging destinations like Thailand, Malaysia, Mexico, Tunisia, Morocco, Sri Lanka and Bali. Bowling Alone, prepared by Robert Putnam (2001) in the context of the USA in the 1980s, highlights the plight of communities incapable or not empowered to develop a healthy and vibrant future for residents. For the benefit and welfare of future generations the shared social capital of communities was recognised. Inevitably, the social and cultural landscape needed additional resources in conservation and enhancement to be preserved for future generations and in a conscious effort by stakeholders working connectedly and collaboratively (Putnam, 2001). He also encouraged host communities to identify and share values and beliefs that would ultimately underpin regeneration and development for all residents as well as provide a base for concurrence on what could be further developed for the benefit of all – both resident hosts and their invited guests. Now we recognise the potential for paradigms established in health and wellbeing, specifically in healthcare, that provide a broad framework for driving the social and cultural capital accrual that will be critical for hosting tourism in the years ahead (O'Meara et al., 2002; Choi and Sirakaya, 2006; Huijbens, 2010; Kim et al., 2013; Voigt and Pforr, 2013a). As a matter of public interest, a focus on wellbeing can drive skills for sustaining community capital and the infrastructure needed to support hosts and, in turn, as development broadens appeal of the

destination community, to tourists (Dalziel et al., 2018). To develop the required skills as hosts and as champions the acquisition of a framework to empower people in communities and to develop notions of partnership and cooperation needs exploration through a social wellbeing and health lens (Craig and Taylor, 2002; Wagner and Caves, 2012). Tourism businesses and organisations working in partnership for the benefit of tourists' expenditure effectively need to learn about capacity and capability to expand potential for benefits from tourism to accrue to all in the community; not just return on economic investment in the neo-liberal post-Fordist model (Ritchie and Crouch, 2003; Beeton, 2006). Taylor et al. (2005) drives the argument that capacity building and partnership building go hand-in-hand with increase of social capital and knowledge transfer from successful capacity building in the most diverse communities from inner city to rural village. Carolyn Kagan (2006) is also authoritative on the embedding of shared knowledge from capacity building into communities and between education establishments and communities. Kagan and Duggan (2011) and Kagan et al. (2013) offers solutions through action research in psychology, using health and community services as metaphors for community health and engagement underpinning a tourism offer created, articulated, managed and reviewed from the grass roots of the community (Kagan and Duggan, 2011).

Health and wellbeing as signposts

Kagan espouses inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary approaches using environmentalism and sociological approaches (social constructivism) in her work, therefore, endorsing the potential to use learning from beyond business and commercial (meaning neo-liberal and market-forces) philosophical arguments. There are several potential lessons to hosts from both Taylor et al. (2005), Kagan and Duggan (2011) and Kagan et al. (2013). The first is a belief that a healthy host community, empowered in decision-making and decision-support process and management, is more than competent to deliver outcomes that are sanctioned by the resident hosts and therefore fully ready for consumption and promotion in the marketplace. The second is that an empowered and fully devolved model of endogenous tourism is a learning destination that will profit its residents, its present and future managers as well as delight its tourists (Timothy, 2006). Finally, there is no compromise explicitly or implicitly offered in the model that expects certain members of that community to not benefit from tourism in all dimensions; social, environmental or economic (Brooks, 2015; Fernandes et al., 2013; Murphy, 2013; Timothy, 2012, p. 74; Mulligan et al., 2008). Furthermore, there is difficulty at present in determining for tourism policy and planning an integrative model that incorporates hosts' needs from a multi-disciplinary perspective. Effectively that means that tourism is on the fringe of development rather than at the core of decision making and support (Dredge and Jamal, 2015).

A planning approach

In a soft systems thinking planning approach, SSM, (Checkland, 1981, Checkland and Scholes, 1990) it can be demonstrated that good practices, shared learning and interventions, from both business and society, can contribute to solutions mediated by experiments attempted in other destinations. The planning in soft systems thinking permits spirals of continuous improvement by reflection on aim, objectives, methods, management, monitoring, review and re-visit on-going throughout the cycles of improvement. Specific interventions may include additional resources brought in to remedy skills shortages, coupled to relatively low levels of inspiring leadership or innovation in practices, poor uptake of technology. This was akin to managers working alone in silos, without contemplating coupling, for argument sake, education with service innovation. Unfortunately, these silo scenarios or lack of cross-disciplinary thinking have been commonplace in the early years of boosterism from mass tourism (Guyer, 2015; Vorley and Williams, 2015; Prebensen et al., 2013; Wood and Thomas, 2006). Soft systems

methodologies also provide sounding boards for effective communication and construction of solutions for divisive problems in communities aspiring to better the lives of residents whilst stimulating the demand for tourism as a part of an improving socio-cultural capital base. If we examine values and beliefs before committing to action we can plan for a sustainable model of tourism that is endogenous, engages many members of the host community in preparing and delivering the services that are advertised. As Kagan *et al.* (2013) comment, it is from the welfare of community that the wellspring of innovation to coordinate tourism may arise. The community can plan experiences that are commensurate with those values and beliefs and can commence a programme of learning and engagement that can support many residents and be supported by others who choose not to engage in tourism themselves (Sherlock and Nathan, 2008; Thomas, 2012). To plan for the future requires substantial investment in policies that support healthy and vibrant free economy-based communities. To develop policies that support business and generate a return on investment for entrepreneurs, commands leadership and a bottom-up, endogenous managed approach (Ritchie, 1993; Derrett, 2003). What may be witnessed in the endogenous model is enabling of capacity to innovate with inimitable services and products that generate a surplus in our market-forces model that can be uniquely harnessed by entrepreneurs to harness this unique selling position without compromising the overall wellbeing of the community. It is akin to coupling a powerful electric locomotive to multiple carriages, already valued by all and now laden with goods and services eagerly anticipated by knowing customers. These knowing, or knowledgeable customers, have pent up demand for these valuable and perceptibly healthy services, given the freely shared prior knowledge of the excellent quality offered. The engine if self-propelled by the pulling power of the green and healthy propulsion from tourism (see exploratory work in Costanza *et al.*, 2017; Hall *et al.*, 2016).

Leadership

To clarify, leadership, coupled to community's concurrence on plans and policies and attention to the underpinning welfare of the resident host are the most important pre-conditions for a healthy and vibrant service and most sought after product offer (Smith *et al.*, 2010). A healthy community with many stakeholders' concerns at its heart has not always been the way forward. Too many privileged individuals sought profit for themselves at the expense of the majority of host residents in the past (Thomas, 2012). A disaffected host community will always struggle to fulfil the needs, let alone the experiences, of visitors to any meaningful degree. If the stories and storytelling of the host resident are not in line with the service and product being marketed the tourist will reject the offer and future visits will be jeopardised (Ray, 1998). Many destinations struggle to maintain the sparkling image that the poster and website appear to offer; often this is a result of the host not buying into that offer as the benefits of tourism are unequally distributed and the costs of providing the product and service offered are expected to be borne by the entire host community (see, e.g. from Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2011). Voigt and Pforr (2013b) sees consumers taking responsibility for their own physical and mental wellbeing. This may be attributable to the devolved charge from governments to individuals to seek wellbeing at no cost to taxpayers. It may also result from a greater awareness in the marketplace by those consumers who are focused on self-help, self-development, alternative therapies and on-going personal or professional development (Mannell and Iso-Ahola, 1987; Ateljevic and Doorne, 2003). These two parallel learning and self-development experiences may well be informing learning across boundaries in many communities. These cross-boundary expectations are not confined to destinations in more-developed parts of the world; these expectations may well be universal (Bushell and Sheldon, 2009). Current publicity about wellness in tandem with tourism is plentiful from traditional sun-sea-sand destinations as well as from emerging markets. It is driven by demand from all sources and is tenuously supported by destination management organisations globally. There is no special sense of wellness or wellbeing as a

fundamental privilege or knowledge base in the north or west; this is a burgeoning opportunity for all destinations to consider, engage with and emerge in competitive situations.

Continuous professional development

This paper takes a socially constructed view of community development through the devices of continuing personal and professional development (CPD) through wellbeing. To do this it necessarily requires a situation and a context to which development can adhere and the factors surrounding the benefits assumed to accrue to community can be evaluated. A lens in CPD that might be useful is established in the systems approach of planning, action, evaluation and reflection (see, e.g. Friedman, 2012). To use this approach requires a focus from both the individual (as Friedman has done) and to evaluate the benefits to the collective, in these cases, the community spatially aggregated at two sites within the Peak District of Derbyshire. Two studies are presented that have slowly become aware of their excellences in harnessing the welfare needs of the community through a deliberate policy of sifting the knowledge behind values, beliefs, stories or narratives underpinning past glories. A realistic evaluation of the pent up demand for community resources and shrewd articulation of Ray's (1998) four-stage model of acceptance and embrace primed the pump of success for these two communities and presents a case study in working at and across the borders of community to start to create a seamless destination of distinction. A self-declared "gem of the Peak" that slowly, but almost by stealth, is driving tourism to be recognised as a very healthy option from which the community may select services and products to continue to direct enterprise for future prosperity.

The "Gem of the Peak" and the "Inland Resort"

The first case study is the small mining town, formerly the site of large quarries for limestone and fluorspar, and earlier from lead, named Wirksworth. This settlement has a recorded history to Saxon days and is physically constrained by limestone hills, the River Ecclesbourne and the aforementioned limestone quarries, largely now defunct. Approximately 10,000 people make their home in Wirksworth. Half the population arrived post the end of the mining era (1970s); half the population is constituted of former mine workers and their descendants. Quite possibly the split between the bourgeois and the latter day emerging service sector and retired is important when reflecting on the nature of welfare and development through the mechanism of tourism. The second study relates to an even smaller ribbon-village development largely to the west bank of the River Derwent called Matlock Bath which has largely been carved by ice and water erosion in the limestone. The two settlements are approximately two miles distant from each other and are connected by a B road and scheduled bus services. What is interesting also is that these two case studies are indeed apparently pursuing separate strategies for development of both the community and of tourism. The second case study has a very small resident population of no more than 700. Together, both locations are visited by the resident population of the Midlands and NW England and Yorkshire conurbations as day trips (approximately 35mn potential day-trippers). They are also frequented by largely European and out of region British visitors for overnight holidays and as a part of a wider touring route between the English South East and Yorkshire and Merseyside. The potential for even more intensive tourism is rapidly being realised by marketing campaigns adopted by Visit Britain (VB) such as "destination of distinction" (campaign of 2010) and "the Grand Tour" (campaign of 2015). So the scene has been set. Two destinations, in close proximity, with a wide appeal to visitors largely for reasons of scenery, heritage, nature and adventure tourism opportunities and largely "in tune" with campaigns to encourage tourism developed by the UK"s national tourism board (VB). These two towns are not remote from other

attractive touring centres with rich heritage of agriculture, mining, the landed gentry of past centuries and similar attempts to focus on wellbeing and welfare of visitors already repeat clients and potential clients from a global marketplace for product UK "the museology" of the entire nation. Friedman indicates that benefits to CPD include perceived public benefit, including visitors, benefits to the tourism sector and related industries in the supply chain and to employers. In addition, benefits accrue to communities from curiosity and a desire to some sort of self-improvement (maybe more implicit than explicit) (Friedman, 2012, p. 54). In the review of the extant literature, the assumptions for better community health and wellbeing include recognition of accumulated social capital during the past century leading to better quality of life across a wide range of locally based stakeholders (see Putnam, 2001; Beeton, 2006; Timothy, 2012). In the past 50-year tourism was largely perceived as a smokeless industry making a contribution to healthy economies deprived of other economic resource bases by the demise of heavy industry and manufacturing. This is so typical of the landscapes and spatial arrangements of these two communities. More work is to be undertaken in the context of the wealthy North with its abundance of skilled labour, diversified economic activity and assumptions of disposable income to be shared for community's social and environmental benefits (again see Putnam, 2001; Altinay *et al.*, 2016; Fernandes *et al.*, 2013). In part tourism can be conceived as avoiding resource depletion as it calls into play volunteers, the elderly (retirees and those with shared knowledge for development) and centres for CPD including high achieving schools and colleges. There is considerable research conducted in the pursuit of health and welfare for the community through incremental steps being taken to improve our knowledge of how to build healthy communities by taking smallish steps at the margins of empowered and healthy communities, especially close physically to the research focus of this paper, in NW England around the conurbation of Manchester (Kagan and Duggan, 2011). In this respect all communities can benefit from improved physical conditions for communities at the margins of social and economic cohesion and productivity. These approaches are also inter-disciplinary as they take metaphors for social and economic improvement for community from healthcare provision and embedding new knowledge about how to fairly spread these benefits more widely. Simply put, a healthy community will engender a better approach to telling the story to visitors and believing explicitly that the story will create stronger bonds between stakeholders based upon a recognition of the procedures to enhance an entire destinations' development based upon agreed stages in shared knowledge (see Ray, 1998). Through these two case studies we can review the collective achievement towards sustainable practices and the pre-conditions observed to achieve, reflect and document development. A systems thinking approach allows us the varying inputs of vision, values and beliefs. These do change over time and do reflect the diverse needs of the resident stakeholders at both sites. This is an iterative process and requires active documentation and reflection to ensure continuity with the improvements suggested, the management techniques employed to realise improvements and the entire monitoring, reflection and action plans emerging from the dialogues and repositories created. Table I refers to some examples of the specific development in the two case studies that are indicative of wellbeing progressively becoming embedded as new knowledge for the benefit of current and future learners. In Case Study 1 the development of a community enterprise incorporates strands of tourism, trade, arts and creative industries. In Study 2 smaller scale partnerships are becoming formed (through a community interest company) that will incorporate spaces and places at the margins of the destination. It is also apparent that actors employed in the reflections and management cycles are often changing. There is a sense of resources insufficiently deployed because of low knowledge of resources previously used and an exhaustion of key performers in this process as they are required to continuously upskill and re-acquaint with a knowledge base that is no longer in practice and is no longer current. That is exactly the problem that be-sets the two communities in the case studies. Moreover, the focus is now on unequal distribution of resources with poor understanding of long-term outcomes of interest to the majority within the community. That

Table I	Communities of engagement: welfare and wellbeing driving specific development in tourism	
Conceptual	Case Study 1	Case Study 2
Wellbeing from the margins (Kagan and Duggan, 2011)	Festival and Carnival – learning to combine resources to cater for a diverse new demand	Developing the events focus in a small community. Taking selected rural sites and applying new business paradigms to exploring boundaries – Mount Cook and the Matlock Bath cliff faces. The imminent formation of a new Community Interest Company (CIC) to oversee new direction for local response to managing tourism in future
Embedded learning (Williams and Williams, 2011)	Business as creatives	Storytelling and the narratives Dedication to re-branding Working to profile the values and brand of "Jewel of the Peak" or "Inland seaside" or "Mystery: My Village"
Re-visioning and joining (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Uyarra, 2010)	University of Derby as a partner – changing orientation from mining and quarrying towards a focus on the service sector and developing an enterprise culture The University of Derby and University of Sheffield supporting the community to retrieve and store narratives of cultural and heritage importance	University of Derby as a partner –adapting to change in production and change in supply. Bringing non-traditional partners together to reflect community goals The University of Derby to refocus the Parish Council on relationship building with existing visitors (repeat visitations) and anticipating success with new markets aligned to existing products
Indicators of success captured in long-term strategy	Better return on funded projects for all – festival and NOW!	Non-traditional partners joining the tourism bandwagon to benefit a wider range of stakeholders
Reflections: management interventions	New Opportunities Wirksworth (NOW!) ten years of interventions designed to promote tourism as well as arts and creatives, education, enterprise culture	Matlock Bath Parish Council – reflections on trajectory for stakeholders in tourism development
Feed forward and enduring repository (Uyarra, 2010)	University of Derby Online Research (UDORA) and engaging the stakeholders in research	UDORA and disseminating practices to support enterprise and build on existing narratives in storytelling

brings the reader to evaluate the roles of public and private sector partners in achieving some type of sustainable development. These two communities embarked at different stages in their product lifecycle (maturity in both cases) according to the theoretical approach of Butler (1980). Unfortunately for the Butler approach there is effectively only resurgence and dynamic adjustment to changing demand (fashions, trends and preferences in consumption) or decay and eventual collapse of the tourism offer and tourism-purpose built economic contribution. The actual model in Table I reflects the complexity and multi-faceted nature of wellbeing meshed to vibrant tourism destination. As has been observed earlier, research from health and sociology drives wellbeing from the margins (after Kagan and Duggan, 2011). The tourism or, tourist, experience has so many dimensions and at best that experience and expectation demands that destinations connect with each other to satisfy the wide variety of intangibles and tangibles expected across boundaries or community borders, almost as of right, in the current demand-driven environment of tourism consumption (Valente et al., 2015).

The learning destination

The engaged and determined community, concurring on ways forward that can maximise visitors' experiences without compromising values of key stakeholder groups can be construed as the learning destination. Therefore, a learning destination must share cross-boundary services and skills and be prepared to remain competitive as well as cooperative and collaborative with neighbouring spaces for recreation and development (see a South African example, Donaldson, 2018 and a Swedish case study in Solomon, 2015). The learning destination as an educative process with new applications in learning towns (Williams and Williams, 2011) defends the role of partners in the process of regeneration or

resurgent community-driven offers for tourism (and other enterprise) and an explicit acknowledgement that universities and other reflective organised learning centres (schools and colleges) must embed the experiments within communities in the curriculum and link the outcomes of research back into community governance. Addressing the new values and beliefs accrued during regenerative action is the next phase in the engagement. At this stage and during this action the purposeful and reiterative process of active learning on the shared goals and created identity is recognised and embedded more purposefully as a socially constructed process that is actively espoused by a majority of stakeholders (Altinay et al., 2016). The following stage embeds learning in governance and political process for a wider set of stakeholders who juggle competing demands from the wider set of stakeholders who occasionally divert resources away from community-led enterprise into supportive and medically driven survival packages for unfortunately dispossessed stakeholders. These dispossessed do not engage in education, do not expect to contribute to development agendas, tend to prefer status quo and have no intention to actively pursue community development issues at a personal, or active reflective level (Craig and Taylor, 2002). We may consider this faction as disposed and disenfranchised (see Putnam, 2001). A final stage in engaging the stakeholders with the outcomes is exceedingly important. Without the reflections and critical review there can be no re-addressing of vision and values; there can be little concurrence (within the majority of stakeholders) over stages of development and therefore reiterative action in plans and success stories cannot be embedded in factual accounts of development. The "hearsay" of key players (movers and shakers of change) can be challenged because there is no documentation of success and failure and a reluctance to pick up on the development agenda and programme because of a lack of agreement on past success stories. It is the creation of an enduring repository in a socially constructed, systems thinking reflection that must be highlighted to our majority decision-makers and decision-support librarians that has been missed in the academy (Guyer, 2015). Documenting healthy communities through praxis and reflections is critical to changing the ways in which things are "done around here" for everyone's collective development.

Plate 1   Old age transport in context: used by both visitor and resident

Source: Author

Table II	Working across boundaries collaborative services shared		
Destination 1: Small UK Market Town, 5,000 residents	Destination 2: Small UK Inland resort, 700 residents		Ownership
Festival (arts)	Festival (music)		Public and private
Volunteer Staffed Recreation Centre	Walking Sightseeing Dales		Public
Small cooperatively run community cinema	Three small museums (mining, aquarium, textiles, pumps)		Private
Farmers market	Storytelling sessions (museum)		Private
Railway	Illuminations		Private (charity)
Garden festival	Triathlon and Water Sports/Kayaking		Private
Performance	Food and Toilets		Public and private

Plate 2 Sharing open gardens residents and visitors

Source: Author

Conclusion

Communities work organically to benefit resident and business stakeholders with resources to maintain a forward trajectory that propels the hosts to set out the offer for guests at the core of the community and additionally along its margins, and at its periphery. Communities are connected; visitors use the arteries and veins of the various cores to navigate through space to adjacent communities, therefore connecting communities and creating destinations that have, by nature of their expressed beliefs, identities and now brands, competing but complementary offers to guests (Plate 1).

These offers are genuine, insofar as they originate from hosts with little guile or intrigue, and can be evaluated for quality and appeal of attractiveness. Linked offers allow tourism to be mutable; we link the unusual and idiosyncratic, complete with local narratives (Table II). Connected offers across the margins and connecting cores allow stories to flourish. This connectivity, these stories, the on-going continuous development and the actions of key entrepreneurs allow the community to successfully turn into destinations that are truly distinctive and, because they self-propel by virtue to the beliefs and values, they retain elements of healthy welfare for all (see an Italian case study in Presenza et al., 2013).

Throughout this paper the comparison is made between the source of wellbeing in community and the extent to which tourism and visitors bring a sense of rejuvenation and

development to destinations. There is a palpable tension for communities' key stakeholders in both serving a community and its interests and in managing a destination for the benefit of residents and invited visitors (Plate 2). The former requires that stakeholders cooperate and collaborate through networks and form and informal partnerships through a slow but deliberate process of social engineering. That is, new services, events and festivals and projects that are underpinned by bringing together diverse fields of activity. The latter is concerned more with managing visitors' experiences and exploring options to allow experiences to be co-created and embedded within destinations with scant attention paid to the legacy of the management actions involved. Healthy communities can only become healthy destinations with a reviewed focus on embedding newly created partnerships and resultant knowledge. Wellness through tourism directly benefits communities through a better understanding that relationships with visitors and their interaction and integration into the fabric of the community can bring. Indirectly, the outcomes of an inter-disciplinary approach using a health and wellbeing model (Kagan, 2006 and Taylor *et al.*, 2005) to the business management lens used by Beeton (2006) and Timothy (2012) is predicated on a better integration of the socio-political lenses now available to communities. Marginal improvements in understanding how the disciplines can be aligned to deliver benefits to host communities can only lead to a sense of wellbeing for hosts that promise to deliver on wellbeing for visitors as well.

References

Altinay, L., Sigala, M. and Waligo, V. (2016), "Social value creation through tourism enterprise", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 100 No. 54, pp. 404-17.

Ateljevic, I. and Doorne, S. (2003), "Culture, economy and tourism commodities: social relations of production and consumption", *Tourist Studies*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 123-41.

Beeton, S. (2006), *Community Development Through Tourism*, Landlinks Press, Collingwood.

Berkes, F. and Ross, H. (2013), "Community resilience: toward an integrated approach", *Society & Natural Resources*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 5-20.

Brooks, G. (2015), "Heritage at risk from tourism, heritage at risk", Tourism at World Heritage Sites Challenges and Opportunities UNWTO, Madrid, pp. 242-3.

Brundtland, G.H., Khalid, M. and Agnelli, S. (1987), *Our Common Future*, United Nations, New York, NY.

Bushell, R. and Sheldon, P.J. (Eds) (2009), *Wellness and Tourism: Mind, Body, Spirit, Place*, Cognizant Communication.

Butler, R.W. (1980), "The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources", *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 5-12.

Carr, N. (2002), "The tourism–leisure behavioural continuum", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 972-86.

Checkland, P. (1981), *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

Checkland, P. and Scholes, J. (1990), *Soft Systems Methodology in Practice*, J Wiley, Chichester.

Choi, H.C. and Sirakaya, E. (2006), "Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 1274-89.

Costanza, R., Alperovitz, G., Daly, H., Farley, J., Franco, C., Jackson, T. and Victor, P. (2017), "Building a sustainable and desirable economy-in-society-in-nature", *Green Economy Reader*, Springer, Cham, pp. 367-454.

Craig, G. and Taylor, M. (2002), "Dangerous liaisons: local government and the voluntary and community sectors", *Partnerships, New Labour and the Governance of Welfare*, pp. 131-47.

Crick, M. (1989), "Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, sex, sights, savings, and servility", *Annual review of Anthropology*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 307-44.

Dalziel, P., Saunders, C. and Saunders, J. (2018), "Local government and natural capital", *Wellbeing Economics*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, pp. 109-27.

Derrett, R. (2003), "Festivals & regional destinations: how festivals demonstrate a sense of community & place", *Rural Society*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 35-53.

Donaldson, R. (2018), "A decade of small town tourism research in South Africa", in Donaldson, R. (Ed.), *Small Town Tourism in South Africa*, Springer, Cham, pp. 13-43.

Dredge, D. and Jamal, T. (2015), "Progress in tourism planning and policy: a post-structural perspective on knowledge production", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 51 No. C, pp. 285-97.

Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P. and Dwyer, W. (2010), *Tourism Economics and Policy*, Vol. 3, Channel View, Clevedon.

Fernandes, C., Raj, R., Griffin, K. and Morpeth, N. (2013), "The impact of cultural tourism on host communities", in Griffin, K., Raj, R. and Morpeth, N. (Eds), *Cultural Tourism*, Cabi, Wallingford, pp. 26-39.

Friedman, A.L. (2012), *Continuing Professional Development: Lifelong Learning of Millions*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Guyer, N. (2015), "The measure of America approach to gauging well-being and opportunity in the United States: concept, application, and impacts at the community level", Social Science Research Council, working papers, Brooklyn.

Hall, C.M., Dayal, N., Majstorović, D., Mills, H., Paul-Andrews, L., Wallace, C. and Van Dao, T. (2016), "Accommodation consumers and providers' attitudes, behaviours and practices for sustainability: a systematic review", *Sustainability*, Vol. 8 No. 7, pp. 1-30.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006), "More than an 'industry': the forgotten power of tourism as a social force", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 1192-208.

Huijbens, E.H. (2010), *Iceland Country Report: The Mývatn Region as a Possible Nordic Wellbeing Destination*, Icelandic Tourism Research Centre, Akureyri.

Kagan, C. (2006), *Making a Difference: Participation and Well-Being*, New Start Publishing, Liverpool.

Kagan, C. and Duggan, K. (2011), "Creating community cohesion: the power of using innovative methods to facilitate engagement and genuine partnership", *Social Policy and Society*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 393-404.

Kagan, C., Micallef, M., Siddiquee, A., Fatimilehin, I., Hassan, A., Santis, C. and Bunn, G. (2013), "Intergenerational work, social capital and wellbeing", *Global Journal Community Psychology Practice*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 286-93.

Kim, K., Uysal, M. and Sirgy, M.J. (2013), "How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents?", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 36 No. C, pp. 527-40.

Macbeth, J., Carson, D. and Northcote, J. (2004), "Social capital, tourism and regional development: SPCC as a basis for innovation and sustainability", *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 7 No. 6, pp. 502-22.

Mannell, R.C. and Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1987), "Psychological nature of leisure and tourism experience", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 314-31.

Mulligan, M., Scanlon, C. and Welch, N. (2008), "Renegotiating community life: arts, agency, inclusion and wellbeing", *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 18-42.

Murphy, P.E. (2013), *Tourism: A Community Approach (RLE Tourism)*, Routledge, London.

Nunkoo, R. and Ramkissoon, H. (2011), "Developing a community support model for tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 964-88.

O'Meara, P., Burley, M. and Kelly, H. (2002), "Rural urgent care models: what are they made of?", *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 45-50.

Prebensen, N.K., Vittersø, J. and Dahl, T.I. (2013), "Value co-creation significance of tourist resources", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 42, pp. 240-61.

Presenza, A., Del Chiappa, G. and Sheehan, L. (2013), "Residents' engagement and local tourism governance in maturing beach destinations. evidence from an Italian case study", *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 22-30.

Putnam, R.D. (2001), "Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community", *Simon and Schuster*, New York, NY.

Quarrie, J. (Ed.) (1992), *Earth Summit 1992: The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development*, Regency Press, Rio de Janeiro.

Ray, C. (1998), "Culture, intellectual property and territorial rural development", *Sociologia ruralis*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 3-20.

Ritchie, J.B. (1993), "Crafting a destination vision: putting the concept of resident responsive tourism into practice", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 379-89.

Ritchie, J.B. and Crouch, G.I. (2003), "The competitive destination: a sustainable tourism perspective", Cabi, Wallingford.

Rojek, C. (2000), "Mass tourism or the re-enchantment of the world? Issues and contradictions in the study of travel", *New Forms of Consumption*, pp. 51-70.

Sherlock, J.J. and Nathan, M.L. (2008), "How power dynamics impact the content and process of nonprofit CEO learning", *Management Learning*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 245-69.

Smith, M., Deery, M. and Puzko, L. (2010), "The role of health, wellness and tourism for destination development", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol. 1 No. 17, pp. 94-5.

Solomon, L. (2015), "Rejuvenation and strategic development of coastal tourism in Northern Sweden: the cases of Norrbyskär and Holmön in Umeå municipality", masters' thesis, Umeå University Department of Geography and Economic History, Umea.

Taylor, M., Purdue, D., Wilson, M. and Wilde, P. (2005), "Evaluating community projects. joseph rowntree foundation", available at: www.jrf.org.uk (accessed 10 October 2018).

Thomas, R. (2012), "Business elites, universities and knowledge transfer in tourism", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 553-61.

Timothy, D. (2006), "Empowerment and stakeholder participation in tourism destination communities", in Church, A. and Coles, T. (Eds), *Tourism, Power and Space*, Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 199-216.

Timothy, D.J. (2012), *Destination Communities and Responsible Tourism. Responsible Tourism: Concepts, Theory and Practice*, CABI, Wallingford, pp. 72-81.

Tisdell, C. (2000), *The Economics of Tourism*, Vols I/2, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Uyarra, E. (2010), "Conceptualizing the regional roles of universities, implications and contradictions", *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 18 No. 8, pp. 1127-246.

Valente, F., Dredge, D. and Lohmann, G. (2015), "Leadership and governance in regional tourism", *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 127-36.

Vanhove, N. (1997), "Mass tourism and tourism, development and growth: The challenge of sustainability", in Pigram, J.J. and Wahab, S. (Eds), *Tourism, Development and Growth: The Challenge of Sustainability*, Routledge, pp. 50-78.

Voigt, C. and Pforr, C. (2013a), *Wellness Tourism: A Destination Perspective*, Vol. 33, Routledge, London.

Voigt, C. and Pforr, C. (2013b), "Towards a conceptualisation of wellness tourism", in Voigt, C. and Pforr, C. (Eds), *Wellness Tourism: A Destination Perspective*, Routledge, London, pp. 43-68.

Vorley, T. and Williams, N. (2015), "Creating and sustaining a model of community-based enterprise learning: a participatory case study of ready hubs", *Community Development*, Vol. 46 No. 5, pp. 559-79.

Wagner, F. and Caves, R. (Eds) (2012), *Community Livability: Issues and Approaches to Sustaining the Well-Being of People and Communities*, Routledge, London.

Williams, N. and Williams, C. (2011), "Tackling barriers to entrepreneurship in a deprived urban neighbourhood", *Local Economy*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 30-42.

Wood, E. and Thomas, R. (2006), "Measuring cultural values – the case of residents' attitudes to the saltaire festival", *Tourism Economics*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 137-45.

Corresponding author

Peter Wiltshier can be contacted at: P.Wiltshier@derby.ac.uk