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PROLOGUE

This journey began in 2009 on the other side of the world, when the author spent a short period exploring the coastal borderlands of Schleswig-Holstein, Northern Germany and Sønderborg, Southern Denmark. Sitting in the beer gardens, cafés and bakeries it was clear there was a significant domestic and cross-border tourism market in the region. And while restaurant menus were published in at least three languages and there was very limited evidence of the border when driving between the two nations, there were challenges. Tourists and service staff could not always communicate effectively; the currency was different on each side of the border and the overall tourism destination image was divided across the region. This sparked the author’s interest in a project that aimed to increase ties across the region, eventually leading the author to investigate the European Union’s initiative to integrate border regions across Europe.

The author knew that there were numerous state border regions in his native Australia where tourism was an important part of the economy – with the Gold Coast and Tweed region among the first to come to mind. Drawing parallels with Europe, the author started to ponder how state borders in Australia influenced tourism management in these locations. It quickly became evident that this question had not been the focus of research and that there was limited international research that could assist in understanding the situation. Hence, this became the aim of this thesis – to understand how Australian state borders influence tourism management.

The process involved in coming to a conclusion has been convoluted. The research involved in this thesis was completed between 2010 and 2014, but due to a range of circumstances outside the author’s control, the thesis was not completed in its entirety until 2016. Given the longitudinal nature of the research, the thesis provides important historically and culturally grounded insights that are just as relevant today as they will be in years to come. Borders are not static and there will always be change. This thesis represents a marker of the conditions over a period of time. It provides significantly broad, contextualised grounding in the historical development of borders as well as significant depth with respect to the way borders have culturally, politically and administratively manifested in the case study region. Within the specified context, the depth and breadth of the exploration is unprecedented.

In the stages leading to thesis submission, a decision was made not to update the institutional and administrative conditions that may have changed since data collected. It was considered important to maintain the alignment between the data collection and these conditions. Introducing new information that could not have been known by the participants at the time of the data collection would only complicate the already complex cross-border environment. Moreover, updating the background context would have introduced an unnecessary delay in thesis submission without changing the findings in any remarkable way.
ABSTRACT

The literature on border regions remains limited and fragmented, and has been largely restricted to international borders in Europe and North America. Significantly less attention has been paid to tourism management in border regions, especially in subnational border regions. This is despite calls for further research, especially in view of issues known to exist in cross-border tourism management in subnational border regions, in Australia and internationally. This thesis contributes to filling this gap in the literature by aiming to identify, analyse and evaluate the opportunities and challenges for tourism management across subnational political borders in Australia and to make recommendations to improve cross-border tourism management into the future.

The thesis contributes a social constructionist approach to the existing research, which embraces the messiness of border regions as negotiated, multi-scale spaces where multiple realities and perspectives exist. The focus was on three cross-border tourism management episodes in the Central East Coast Border Region, bisected by the New South Wales and Queensland state border. A range of secondary sources, interviews with tourism actors and observations of cross-border meetings informed an understanding of cross-border tourism management in the case study border region. The use of multiple sources of data and the use of crystallisation of the data provided thick descriptions, complexly rendered interpretations and reflected multiple perspectives. An abductive approach to analysis allowed for multiple perspectives to be recognised, while enhancing understanding of the complexity of cross-border tourism management, by interrogating the tourism episodes, as well as the existing literature.

By moving beyond the existing approach to investigating cross-border tourism management, often focused on a single scale and on integration of administrative units of government, the thesis provides a significant contribution to knowledge by proffering a perspective that sees tourism management in subnational border regions as more nuanced. It shows that cross-border tourism management in subnational border regions is characterised by multiple borders, multiple networks, multiple scales, diverse views on tourism and multiple meanings of borders. Based on the research and the existing literature, the thesis recommends (1) improved project management of cross-border projects, (2) the establishment of Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism and (3) strengthening of Federal and State Government support of cross-border projects.

The thesis concludes that subnational borders are far from a “nostalgic fiction”, but require novel policy and governance approaches. As such, subnational border regions, and cross-border tourism management, is a rich area for future research where considerably more work is needed.
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC</td>
<td>Australia’s Green Cauldron (a CBTME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTN</td>
<td>Australian Regional Tourism Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South-East Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBTM</td>
<td>Cross-border Tourism Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBTME</td>
<td>Cross-border Tourism Management Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERRA</td>
<td>Central Eastern Rainforest Reserves of Australia (renamed the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSGC</td>
<td>Connecting Southern Gold Coast (economic development organisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>Convention and Visitor Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEDI</td>
<td>QLD Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMO</td>
<td>Destination Marketing Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSEWPC</td>
<td>Department for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (Federal Government Department jointly-leading the Australia’s Green Cauldron program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>Experience Development Strategy (developed for AGC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRP</td>
<td>Gross Regional Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERREG</td>
<td>A cross-border cooperation program of the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFTA</td>
<td>North American Free Trade Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLRC</td>
<td>National Landscape Reference Committee (directing AGC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales (Australian State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Parks Australia (Federal parks agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>Queensland (Australian State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Regional Development Australia (joint Federal and State agency in NSW, and a Federal agency in Queensland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRIF</td>
<td>Regulation Reduction Incentive Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTO</td>
<td>Regional Tourism Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Rainforest Way (a CBTME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>South-East Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Tourism Australia (Federal tourism agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>Tourism Research Australia (Federal tourism research agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 BORDERS & TOURISM MANAGEMENT: AN INTRODUCTION

1.1 SETTING THE SCENE

Globalisation, as a meta-process, is increasingly driving megatrends and interdependencies in a complex and tangled way (Hall 2001; Wahab & Cooper 2001). Urry (2010: 354) has posited that an important aspect of globalisation processes is the ‘wide variety of machines and technologies that dramatically compress or shrink time-space’ carrying ‘people, information, money, images and risks, and flow within and across national societies in increasingly brief moments of time’. This compression of time-space has resulted in high levels of global networks and global flows (Castells 1996, 1998). Bauman (2000) has called this process liquid modernity, acknowledging that traditional orders are being broken down, while boundaries become blurred and people, objects and information flow freely, reordering societal spaces.

A dominant point of debate regarding globalisation is the assumption made by Agnew (2001: 133), and originally supported by others (Meyer 1999; Meyer, Boli, Thomas & Ramirez 1997), that ‘everywhere in the world is becoming alike economically and culturally as a consequence of globalisation’. The main point here is that consumer tastes are becoming homogenous and the protective forces of nation-states are being eroded. The alternative view has argued that glocalisation is an important aspect of globalisation. It acknowledges that, while some cultural and economic features are becoming increasingly homogenised globally, other features – primarily at the local scale – are reinforced (Dredge 2001; Meyer 2000; Robertson 1992; Swyngedouw 1997, 2004). Glocalism suggests that, in a world of global flows, ‘[i]ssues in one area of the world can affect individuals in faraway lands; thus issues at the local level can have global ramifications, just as global developments can have local effects. The local and global thereby converge’ (Harmsworth 2001: 3).

In the context of globalisation, numerous researchers posit that nation-states no longer matter (Anderson, Brook & Cochrane 1995; Guehenno 1995; Sassen 1996). One example of this perspective is that of Ohmae (1995: 11), who believes political entities and their borders are a ‘nostalgic fiction’, arguing that ‘in terms of real flows of economic activity, nation-states have already lost their role as meaningful units of participation in the global economy of today’s borderless world’. A conflicting perspective has been that ‘in some ways the modern nation-state, with its sovereignty defined by familiar territorial boundaries, seems as firmly rooted as ever’, as ‘tax-collectors stop at the boundaries, immigrants are stopped at the same border and transnational (or, more strictly speaking, trans-state) linkages can still be snapped off by independent state power’ (Anderson et al. 1995: 67). This perspective is shared by other border studies researchers, who argue that ‘the notion of a world entirely without borders does not seem likely in the foreseeable future’ (Alm & Burkhart 2013; Ganster & Lorey 2005;
Herzog 2014; Herzog & Sohn 2014: 444; van den Broek & Smulders 2015). In particular, Newman and Paasi (1998: 173) explain that the borderless world debate is futile, proposing that political boundaries in a globalised world will continue to exist, albeit in changing forms: ‘If endisms indicate a world without boundaries, postisms announce the emergence of fresh boundaries and beyondisms allude to the elongation of boundaries’.

In this context of globalised flows, glocalism and constantly changing political boundaries, regions adjacent to existing political boundaries are an important area of research, yet they have received limited attention (Alm & Burkhart 2013; Ganster & Lorey 2005; Herzog 2014; Herzog & Sohn 2014; Newman 2002, 2006b; Pellerin 2005; Rumford 2008). This is despite calls for a stronger conceptualisation of border regions (Newman 2006a) and research that considers a broad diversity of border regions; each within their own socially constructed narrative (Herzog 2014; Newman & Paasi 1998). An area where potential is thought to exist for border regions is in cross-border collaborative efforts.

Researchers in numerous disciplines suggest cross-border collaboration in border regions holds significant potential for economic development, innovation and knowledge sharing (Herzog 2014; Johnson 2009; Lundquist & Tripl 2009; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] 2013; Perkmann 2003; Perkmann & Sum 2002; Tripl 2010; Van Gorp 2009). This perspective has been particularly prevalent in Europe, which is where much of the research has focused (Newman & Paasi 1998) and where the European Union [EU] has established policies to encourage borderlanders to work across borders (Oliveria 2015; Scott 1998, 2012; Scott & Collins 1997; Topaloglou 2008). This suggests that numerous challenges exist for cross-border collaboration, including in tourism management.

Applied to tourism, it is clear that globalisation, increasing mobilities and the changing nature of nation-states have important implications. The blurring of boundaries and the almost uninterrupted flow of people, capital and information from one location to another, in many parts of the world, present significant challenges to the way in which tourism destinations are not only conceptualised but also managed (Dredge & Jamal 2013). Adding to this challenge is the changing form of the management of tourism in regions in most western nations where multi-faceted interests exist at numerous interacting scales (Dredge 2006a; Dredge & Jenkins 2007, 2011; Lawrence 2009; Verbole 2000, 2009; Wang & Krakover 2008). Tourism management in border regions has additional complexity as tourism actors work across a liminal space where existing political structures and sets of scales meet (Timothy 2001; Timothy & Teye 2004).

1 The closure of previously open borders within the EU, in response to the Syrian refugee crisis (Bouras 2016; Chen 2015; Hartley-Brewer 2015; Morris & Gray 2015), and the decision by the citizens of the United Kingdom to exit the EU (The Economist 2016) are just two recent examples that support this claim.
The challenges that exist for tourism managers do not necessarily exist for tourists, in a time of greater mobility and changing boundaries. Tourists may choose to explore a border region due to its attraction and experiences (Butler 1996, 2002), with little consideration of physical, geographical or administrative meanings of the border that happens to exist in the location (Beritelli, Bieger & Laesser 2013; Blasco 2013; Bowman 1994; Castano, Perez & Quintanilla 2010; Felsenstein & Freeman 2001, 2002; Lord, Putrevu & Shi 2008; Smith & Hinch 1996; Timothy 2000a). On the other hand, the border and its context may be the main attraction to a border region (Gelbman 2010; Gelbman & Timothy 2010; Timothy 1995). As is the case for border regions more broadly, cross-border tourism management [CBTM] has been argued to have significant potential in terms of better aligning supply with tourist experiences (Swarbrooke 2001), sharing costs and resources, developing more globally competitive regions (Naipaul, Wang & Okumus 2009), regional product enhancement, and knowledge sharing and learning (Wang, Hutchinson, Okumus & Naipaul 2013). Timothy (2000b: 120) has posited, despite the importance of understanding tourism in border regions, that ‘cross-border management has been virtually ignored by tourism scholars’, while Sofield (2006: 103) makes a similar argument in saying that ‘there are very few [studies] that specifically examine the role of borders in tourism’. Furthermore, much of the limited research conducted on cross-border tourism has been restricted in terms of the research context (Yang & Peng 2012).

Of the small number of studies that have dealt with the issue of tourism management in border regions, few studies have acknowledged that tourism management in border regions presents a “wicked problem”2 (Batie 2008; Rittel & Webber 1973). Further, while the broader literature on borders has focused mainly on international borders and given limited attention to subnational border regions (Strihan 2008), the tourism literature has given just as limited attention to any sort of border regions (Sofield 2006; Timothy 2001). Australian state borders have been recognised as influencing the activity of tourism actors in border regions (Lade 2006b, 2010; Smith 2005, 2011) and the multi-scale nature of tourism management in Australia has been found to impact the management of tourism in subregions (Dredge, Ford & Whitford 2011a; Jenkins 2000; Lawrence 2009). Despite this, no study has considered the CBTM in the context of Australia’s subnational border regions.

---

2 This is discussed in Chapter 3. Characteristics of wicked problems include difficulty of definition, multiple interdependencies, multi-causality, instability, a frequent lack of clear solutions, and social complexity. They rarely sit within the responsibility of a single organisation/agency, and attempts to address them may be thwarted by changing behaviour and chronic policy fatigue, and can lead to unforeseen consequences (Australian Public Service Commission 2007; Batie 2008; Rittel & Webber 1973).
1.2 **This Study: Research Aim and Objectives**

This thesis focuses on tourism management in a subnational border region in Australia. It goes beyond static accounts and descriptions of cross-border tourism by recognising that the fluid movement of people, ideas and resources across borders creates political, administrative and physical challenges for competitive and innovative tourism systems. The thesis specifically seeks to investigate the opportunities and challenges for CBTM between two Australian States – New South Wales (NSW) and Queensland (QLD).

Australia’s federal system of government is unique. The States enjoy wide-ranging powers and high levels of sovereignty, so interactions over some matters and the lack of interaction over others creates a very challenging context in which to manage tourism. This is further exacerbated by global-local flows of people and goods. This thesis therefore acknowledges that the centre of analysis of tourism in border regions, should not be static, nor be limited by the lines on a map that create and administer space (Newman 2006a; Paasi 1996, 2010). Rather, the border processes that affect the lives of borderlanders ‘on a daily basis, most significantly, at the local and micro scales of sociospatial activity’ (Newman & Paasi 1998: 197) should be the focus of attention. Finally, being an applied study, the thesis looks to provide outcomes that can strengthen tourism management in Australian and similar subnational border regions.

The research reported here aims to *identify, analyse and evaluate the opportunities and challenges for tourism management across subnational political borders in Australia and to make recommendations to improve cross-border tourism management into the future.*

To achieve this aim, the following research objectives were formulated to provide tactical direction to the thesis.

1. Explore the issues associated with cross-border tourism management at an international scale and appraise their relevance in managing tourism in Australian subnational border regions (addressed in Chapters 2 and 3).
2. Develop a conceptual framework and research approach to explore tourism management in border regions that acknowledges the complexity of cross-border tourism management (addressed in Chapter 4).
3. Critically examine the South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for cross-border tourism management (addressed in Chapters 5, 6 and 7).
4. Synthesise and evaluate the opportunities and challenges that exist for cross-border tourism management in the subnational border region of South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales (addressed in Chapters 8 and 9).
5. Provide recommendations regarding how to manage the opportunities and challenges of subnational cross-border tourism management in Australia (addressed in Chapter 10).
The research carried out to address these objectives was informed by a range of literature but particularly draws on existing research in the areas of geopolitical studies, sociology and tourism management. While it considers work that has been done in these fields, the thesis focuses in particular on the dynamic relations and perspectives that exist among organisations and individual actors interacting at numerous scales both within and outside border regions and that affect the development of tourism in the border region.

As border regions are heterogeneous and cannot be understood as ‘primordial but rather situational and contextual’ (Newman & Paasi 1998: 79) and each tourism ‘destination operates in a unique wider environmental and political context’ (Fyall, Fletcher & Spyriadis 2009: 21), this thesis investigates existing knowledge regarding cross-border management, but deals with a specific case study and its context in Australia. This approach seeks to provide a deep and rich analysis of a case with relevance to other similar situations in other subnational border regions both in Australia and internationally.

1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

Tourism is argued to be among the world’s largest industries (Lundberg, Krishnamoorthy & Stavenga 1995), but this point has not been without significant debate (Leiper 2004, 2008; Leiper, Stear, Hing & Firth 2008; Lew 2011; Smith 1998a, 1998b). Regardless of the level of agreement among researchers in terms of whether tourism is the largest industry, it is commonly accepted that ‘tourism has experienced continued growth and deepening diversification to become one of the fastest growing economic sectors in the world’ (World Tourism Organization 2013b). At a time when multiple factors are threatening future prosperity (Ketels 2016; Stutchbury 2015), Australia is in significant need for stronger growth and economic diversification, making tourism an important industry in the country. At the regional and local scales, which are the focus of this thesis, Baker and Cameron (2008: 81) have argued ‘[t]ourism frequently acts as a catalyst for other development’. As such, tourism is considered an important means for ‘promoting economic development and ameliorating regional inequalities’ (Jackson 2006: 695). This is something that governments across the western world have recognised, with many approaching this activity using a collaborative approach that involves numerous actors and interests (Dredge & Jamal 2013; Dredge & Jenkins 2011; Healey 1997, 2003). To ensure that these collaborative processes are as productive as possible, it is crucial that they be understood. By studying tourism in a region, these insights provide an important reflection of other sectors and industries in an area (Henderson 2001).

Tourism is an important source of economic activity in border regions (Herzog & Sohn 2014; Jackson 2006), which are often in need of economic stimulus; it has potential to modify borders and their functions (Timothy, Guia & Berthet 2014). In particular, international border regions have been found to hold a politically peripheral situation, to be thinly populated and to have a
history of being dependent on transverse traffic (Buursink 2001; Hartmann 2006). They receive limited government recognition and support (Johnson 2009; Perkmann 2003; Tripll 2010), face limited expansion possibilities, often have insufficient infrastructure and ‘lopsided production systems’ (Hassink, Dankbaar & Corvers 1994: 7), and attract low growth industries (Van Gorp 2009). It is not well understood how they can be turned into more sustainable regions (Herzog 2014).

As will be explained in Chapter 3, tourism does have significant potential to drive economic development in border regions, with such regions often containing features – such as unspoilt natural environments (Butler 1996, 2002; Zbicz 1999) – that tourists find appealing in a tourism destination region. To unleash this potential and increase competitiveness in a globalised world, regions need to work collaboratively (Porter 1998, 2000b, 2003, 2009); in border regions, work needs to be done to align tourist experiences with management strategies. In most of the world, tourism management boundaries reflect political boundaries and in some cases these ‘do not match tourist perceptions of the geographical extent of the destination’ (Swarbrooke 2001: 120). In Australia, destination boundaries are generally ‘determined bureaucratically rather than from the visitors’ perspective’, using ‘geopolitical boundaries, such as local government areas (LGAs) and regional or state boundaries’ (Australian Regional Tourism Network 2012: 9, 15).

In regard to tourism destination management, ‘progress to date on achieving collaboration has been slow, anecdotal and fragmented’ (Naipaul et al. 2009: 464), while limited studies of tourism in border regions have found numerous barriers and challenges to exist in cross-border management (see Section 3.5.1). This has resulted in calls for research into subnational border regions more broadly (Strihan 2008) and substantially more investigation of tourism destination management in border regions (Haugland, Ness, Gronseth & Aarstad 2011; Sofield 2006; Timothy 2001; Weidenfeld 2013). Given the discussion presented here, this thesis makes the following contributions:

1. It contributes a conceptual framework and research approach that allows for the exploration of tourism management in other border regions, while acknowledging the complexity of cross-border tourism management.

2. It is the first in-depth investigation of cross-border tourism management in an Australian subnational border region.

3. It is among the first investigations of CBTM in a state-scale subnational border region internationally.

4. It contributes to the broad issue of inter-destination tourism management across multiple political boundaries, at various scales. This included contributing a further understanding of the opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM.
1.4 Definitions

Key terms in this thesis are defined as follows.

**Border Region** – a trans-border area wherein economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity to a politically defined geographical border (adapted from Buursink 2001; Hansen 1981).

**Borderlander** – a person who lives and works close to a political border, with the boundary having a direct and significant effect on their economic and social life (adapted from Hansen 1977; Paasi 1996).

**Cross-border Tourism Management Episode (CBTME)** – an activity that occurred, or is currently occurring, involving actors working collaboratively to address a tourism management issue across political boundaries. This thesis focuses on three CBTMEs.

**Government Scale** – a group of people with the authority to govern a certain region at a designated scale. In Australia, the Federal and State scales are recognised in the constitution, while the local scale results from State legislation (Acutt 2016; Dredge & Jenkins 2007).

**Northern Rivers** – a region in the north-eastern corner of the State of NSW, adjacent to South-East Queensland. It includes the Tweed, Byron, Ballina, Clarence Valley, Richmond Valley, Lismore and Kyogle Councils. It is defined by the Clarence, Richmond and Tweed Rivers (RDA Northern Rivers NSW 2014).

**South-East Queensland (SEQ)** – a region in the south-eastern corner of QLD, adjacent to North Rivers NSW. It includes 11 local councils, including the Gold Coast and the Scenic Rim in the south, Brisbane in the centre, the Sunshine Coast to the north and Toowoomba to the west (QLD Department of Infrastructure and Planning 2009).

**Scale** – a platform within a vertical set of platforms of specific kinds of social activity that stretch ‘from the global, the supranational, and the national downwards to the regional, the metropolitan, the urban, the local and the body’ (Brenner 2005: 9). It is argued in this thesis that actors at different scales frequently interact and influence one another (Jonas 2006; Paasi 2010;
Some authors use the terms scale and level interchangeably.

**Subnational Border** – also recognised as a regional border; a border that divides regions within a single nation. Such borders can exist at numerous scales (e.g. second/third-order borders) (Timothy 2001). Trans-border areas wherein economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity to a politically defined geographical *subnational border* are labelled subnational border regions (adapted from Hansen 1977; Paasi 1996).

**Tourism** – a subset of travel; in this thesis, tourism includes travellers visiting a region for any period of time, including day-trippers.

**Travel** – ‘Travel refers to the activity of travellers. A traveller is someone who moves between different geographic locations, for any purpose and any duration. The visitor is a particular type of traveller and consequently tourism is a subset of travel’ (World Tourism Organization 2013a).

### 1.5 Research Approach

The research reported in this thesis is underpinned by social constructionism. This approach allows for the complexities and multiplicities involved in Cross-Border Tourism Management Episodes [CBTMEs] to be understood in the richest and most complete way. In keeping with the social constructionist paradigm, the research conducted involved a qualitative methodology and an embedded case study strategy. A ‘critical, situated and *emic*’ approach such as this takes into account the ‘connectedness of things, places, and people that shape everyday life’ (Pernecky 2010: 2) in a border region.

An embedded case study strategy was considered appropriate, as this approach is particularly useful when an investigation aims to detail and develop knowledge about a case or a number of cases (Beeton 2005; Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007; Stake 2000). It is useful in exploring contemporary phenomena not easily distinguished from the context (Yin 2009) and provides a ‘deep understanding of actors, interactions, sentiments, and behaviours for a specific process through time’ (Woodside & Wilson 2003: 497). It is further justified in that other studies of tourism management have used such an approach (Pavlovich 2003; Verbole 2000), while the consideration of numerous case studies over time can ‘expand and generalize theories’ through a process of ‘analytical generalization’ (Yin 2009: 14).

The Australian Central East Coast border region selected as the case study border region generally includes the Gold Coast City and Scenic Rim Region in the State of QLD and the Tweed Shire in the State of NSW. This region was selected as it is the most populous and at the same time the most tourism-oriented border region in Australia. Cross-border tourism challenges were known to exist there and the region shares natural attractions that cross the
.border. Within the region, three tourism ‘episodes’ were selected as the main units of analysis, and actors that were involved in these episodes (individually and collectively) were approached for interviews. The three episodes were selected from among a small number of cross-border tourism processes known to be occurring in the region, based on those episodes which would provide the most useful insight and understanding regarding the research objectives. In this thesis, a CBTME is an activity that occurred, or is currently occurring, across space and time involving actors working collaboratively to address a tourism management issue across political boundaries.

As well as face-to-face semi-structured interviews and participant observation in meetings, secondary sources were collected. The researcher used a process of crystallisation, which involved incorporating ‘multiple forms of analysis and multiple genres of representation into a coherent text or series of texts’ to ensure that ‘deep, thickly described, complexly rendered interpretations of the meanings about the phenomena group’ were produced (Ellingson 2009: 10). Such an approach is well aligned to qualitative research and a social constructionist approach, in that it paints a fuller picture of complex phenomena, provides rich outcomes and greater research rigour (Denzin 2010; Dredge & Hales 2012a; Holstein & Gubrium 2005; Richardson 2000; Saukko 2003).

As opposed to much social science research that attempts to study social issues through a rational scientific approach, this thesis involves an analytical approach that accepts, and embraces, the idea that ‘the world is mainly a mess’ (Law 2004; 2007: 595). Specifically, it recognises that the investigation of social phenomena requires methodological approaches that acknowledge complications, complexities, ambiguities, inter-connectedness, illogicalness, varied perspectives and contradiction (Horn 2001). Using the narrative framework developed by Czarniawska (1997, 2004, 2010), this thesis used an abductive approach\(^3\) to analysis that involved treating each source as a text, interpreted from both a semantic and a semiotic perspective, and developing ‘a new text that will bear this interpretation’ (Czarniawska 1997: 69).

---

\(^3\) As is explained in Section 4.5, *abductive theorising* is a process where the researcher accepts that ‘data are to be taken seriously, and the validity of previously developed knowledge is to be queried’, resulting in analysis where the empirical findings and existing literature are considered together (Reichert 2010: 9).
1.6 **THESIS OUTLINE**

This thesis contains ten chapters guided by the research objectives detailed in Section 1.2 (visualised in Figure 1.1). Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 (*Cross-border Collaboration in International Border Regions: A Review*) and Chapter 3 (*Managing Tourism in Subnational Border Regions: A Review*) address Research Objective 1, by reviewing existing border studies and tourism management literature and appraising the relevance of this work in managing tourism in subnational border regions. Chapter 3 concludes by identifying a significant gap in the literature, which this thesis contributes to fill. Chapter 4 (*Investigating Cross-border Tourism Management: Research Approach*) then addresses Research Objective 2, in developing a conceptual framework and research approach suited to studying the messy, situational and contextual nature of tourism in border regions.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 address Research Objective 3, by exploring the context of opportunities and challenges for CBTM. Chapter 5 (*Forming of an Australian Border Region*) begins this process by exploring the process through which the case study border region formed. Chapter 6 (*Unpacking Messiness: The Central East Coast Border Region*) continues this exploration by considering a number of facets of the case study border region, including the characteristics of the selected LGAs, the inter-connectivity of the border region and issues that exist due to proximity to the border. Chapter 7 (*Three Australian Cross-Border Tourism Management Episodes*) analyses the narratives of the three CBTMEs investigated in the research, providing an understanding of their complexities and setting the scene for the following chapters.

Chapter 8 (*Opportunities in the Central East Coast Border Region*) is the first of two chapters that contribute to Research Objective 4, by synthesising and evaluating the opportunities for CBTM in the case study border region. Chapter 9 (*Challenges in the Central East Coast Border Region*) then analyses the challenges to the success of CBTM in exploiting the opportunities. Chapter 10 (Conclusions and Recommendations) concludes the thesis by reviewing the findings and the significance of the research; it also addresses Research Objective 5 by providing recommendations to improve CBTM.
Figure 1.1 Thesis Outline and Research Objectives

1 Borders and Tourism Management: An Introduction

2 Cross-border Collaboration in International Border Regions: A Review

3 Managing Tourism in Subnational Border Regions: A Review

4 Investigating Cross-border Tourism Management: Research Approach

5 Forming of an Australian Border Region

6 Unpacking Messiness: The Central East Coast Border Region

7 Three Australian Cross-Border Tourism Management Episodes

8 Opportunities in the Central East Coast Border Region

9 Challenges in the Central East Coast Border Region

10 Conclusions and Recommendations

Source: Developed for this research
2 CROS S-BORDER COLLABORATION IN INTERNATIONAL BORDER REGIONS: A REVIEW

This chapter explores the international literature to define the border region concept and investigate the challenges to collaboration in international border regions. It is the first of two chapters that aim to address Research Objective 1, to explore the issues associated with CBTM at an international scale and appraise their relevance in managing tourism in Australian subnational border regions. First, it finds key characteristics of border regions based on an appraisal of the literature. Next, it considers the prevalence of cross-border collaboration in international border regions. Finally, it provides an assessment of the key challenges to cross-border collaboration found in the international literature.

2.1 DEFINING BORDER REGIONS

The regions adjacent to political boundaries have been given a variety of labels, including frontier zones (House 1980; Howitt 2001), borderscapes (Brambilla 2014) and borderlands (Ioannides 2006; Minghi 1994; Morehouse 2006; Pavlakovich-Kochi, Morehouse & Wastl-Walter 2004). These border regions, while the focus of some research attention over a long period of time (early work includes Boggs 1940; Holdich 1916a; Jones 1943), have proven difficult to define and calls for further conceptualisation of borders and border regions have been made (Newman 2006a). This is encapsulated by House (1980: 458), who states ‘[i]t is more readily possible to define a frontier zone in operational terms than to find theoretical justification for its existence’.

As a result of this difficulty, most early attempts at defining border regions by governments have consisted of determining an arbitrary distance from the border and labelling the resulting area a border region. The demilitarised zones that, at times, particularly prior to the 1950s (Herzog & Sohn 2014), existed between countries and effectively served as ‘buffer zones’ are border regions of this kind. An example is the 20 kilometre demilitarised zone on the Italian side of the French-Italian border unilaterally imposed by the Italian Government in 1947 (House 1980). While such zones are no longer common within the EU, a demilitarised zone is in place between North Korea and South Korea, with a two kilometre clearance on each side of the border (Lee & Mjelde 2007; The Sydney Morning Herald 2014).

4 This long standing ‘buffer zone’ has had the interesting impact of allowing biodiversity to develop without human interference and the region now provides an important terrain for scientific knowledge, environmental conservation (Kim 1997; Zbicz 1999) and – perhaps with time – tourism visitation; this, of course, would require cross-border tourism management.
In reviewing the bilateral treaties between European States regarding boundary demarcations, House (1968) found that the width of border regions varied between 10 and 50 kilometres, with the regions on each side of the border having special customs privileges for residents. In Mexico, prior to the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], there were certain privileges available for businesses that were set up within 100 kilometres from the international border on the condition that 100 percent of the products manufactured were exported (House 1980). Although the privileges no longer exist, the 100 kilometre delimitation of the border region is still used by some researchers (e.g. Pezzoli, Kozo, Ferran, Wooten, Rangel Gomez & Al-Delaimy 2014) and agencies (e.g. United States Environmental Protection Agency 2012).

Attempting to determine the variety of impacts that an international political boundary could have on border region citizens, Raffenstin (1974) established that direct, indirect and induced effects differed based on the distance at which a person or community was situated from the border. While this approach did provide some level of insight into the border region situation, it also resulted in a reinforcement of the arbitrary delineations that had been made by governments and did not fully comprehend the diversity of border regions globally. This, Martinez (2008) argues, is a crucial part of any research focusing on border regions.

In criticising an approach to defining border regions based on arbitrary distances from the border, House (1980: 459) concluded that to understand and mitigate the issues faced by border regions, ‘it seems essential that entire administrative units should be included in a definition if there is to be political reality behind attempts to establish effective trans-frontier cooperation’. Although this is a worthy aim, as per the argument of Martinez (1994b), and even House (1980) himself, the diversity of nations and states that share borders makes such an assumption very difficult in practice. This is particularly well illustrated through the research of Scott and Collins (1997), who examined the significantly different governance structures in the neighbouring countries of Germany and Poland, where to define a border region as a political-administrative unit would be much easier in a decentralised federal political system like Germany, but less meaningful in a centralised system like Poland.

A more useful approach to defining border regions has been to remove the arbitrary notion of distance from the political border and the relevance of administrative units in determining what areas are border regions. This approach involves taking the perspective of the persons impacted by political boundaries. Hansen (1977; 1981: 19) was one of the first to take this approach in defining border regions as ‘areas whose economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity to an international boundary’. Such a definition acknowledges the heterogeneous nature of border regions (Johnson, Jones, Paasi, Amoore, Mountz, Salter & Rumford 2011; Martinez 1994b; Newman & Paasi 1998; Sidaway 2011). Paasi (1996: 75)
argues that one of the major failings of research on border regions has been the way in which borders and their impact on borderlanders have been conceptualised, maintaining:

Boundaries are therefore not merely lines on the ground but, above all, manifestations of social practice and discourse. The construction of the meaning of communities and their boundaries occurs through narratives: ‘stories’ that provide people with common experiences, history and memories, and therefore bind these people together.

In a more general sense, Paasi (2011: 13) contends all social life, not just the social life of those living and working in border regions, is impacted by political borders, saying: ‘boundaries are not merely lines limiting spaces – rather they penetrate social (boundary producing) practices all over society’. Newman (2006a) also makes the point that it is the border processes, as opposed to the border per se, which need to be at the centre of analysis. While such arguments appear to remove the focus of research away from the specific case of regions directly adjacent to borders, Newman and Paasi (1998: 197) make the important qualification that border processes ‘affect our lives on a daily basis, most significantly, at the local and micro scales of sociospatial activity’.

In line with this perspective, some researchers have defined border regions as locations where people on each side of a border ‘share values, beliefs, feelings and expectations with people on the other side of the border’ (Konrad & Nicol 2008: 32). Perkmann (2003: 157), however, feels this outlook is too narrow, arguing that border regions do not need to be ‘built upon cultural or ethnic commonalities, a common historical background, existing functional interdependencies or a mere community of interests’. The important aspect of this debate is the strong argument for defining border regions as spaces where border narratives exist, whether as shared cross-border narratives or, where the border is completely closed, as narratives of borderlanders that are completely independent on either side of the border (Martinez 1994b; Paasi 1996) (see Figure 2.1 for a common categorisation of interaction in border regions). An extension of this argument is the encouragement for researchers to ‘see like a border’, by ‘acknowledging that borders can be viewed from a multiplicity of (sometimes contradictory) perspectives’ (Rumford 2012: 894)⁵.

A further issue that is not considered in the definition offered by Hansen (1977, 1981), or the other researchers that place emphasis on the borderlanders, is the importance of context in the consideration of border regions. Chen (2005: 36) made this point when faced with the issue of defining the concept of subregions in the context of South-East Asian cross-border trading.

---

⁵ This is opposed to more traditional views where researchers would ‘see like a state’, accepting political borders as a priori and not to be questioned (Rumford 2012).
He recognised that both ‘general and specific definitions do not appear to capture the multiple dimensions and full complexity of the transborder subregion’. Chen (2005) recognised the importance of considering the context of the cross-border regions in such definitions. Although not the specific focus of Chen’s (2005) work⁶, this approach recognises that cross-border regions cannot be considered as simply regions located beside political borders, but rather as regions involving social actors that are influenced by and influence processes at various scales. A similar point has been made by Zimmerbauer (2011: 213), who emphasised the importance of conceptualising ‘borders as multicontextual and multilayered social constructs that are constantly being reproduced in various social practices’.

Figure 2.1 Martinez’s Categorisation of Interaction in Borderlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alienated Borderlands</th>
<th>Co-existent Borderlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tension prevails.</td>
<td>Stability is an on and off proposition. Border remains slightly open, allowing for the development of limited binational interaction. Residents of each country deal with each other as casual acquaintances, but borderlanders develop closer relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border is functionally closed, and cross-border interaction is totally or nearly totally absent. Residents of each country act as strangers to each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-dependent Borderlands</td>
<td>Integrated Borderlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability prevails most of the time. Economic and social complementarit prompt increased cross-border interaction, leading to expansion of borderlands. Borderlanders carry on friendly and cooperative relationships.</td>
<td>Stability is strong and permanent. Economies of both countries are functionally merged and there is unrestricted movement of people and goods across the boundary. Borderlanders perceive themselves as members of one social system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Martinez (1994b: 3)

---

⁶ This work was interested in much larger cross-border regions, such as the Greater Southeast China Subregion, which includes Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the Chinese mainland provinces of Hainan, Guangdong and Fujian.
Others suggest that borders and border regions, and their meanings, are in a constant state of turmoil because of the agency of social actors (Paasi 2009, 2010). This is illustrated by Paasi (2010: 2297), who suggests ‘regions condition and are conditioned by politics, culture, economics, governance, and power relations’ that occur ‘both inside and outside the regional process […] with scale-crossing complexity’. He argues that all regions, whether border regions or not, have ‘not always been there: [they] ha[ve] been constructed and will eventually disappear’ (2299); they change through a process that involves numerous, often elite, actors – including politicians, the media, entrepreneurs, teachers, business coalitions and volunteer associations – from a variety of scales and are not necessarily located at the local scale but have an important influence on those within the border region. Moreover, borderscapes involve and are created by ‘multiple groups of actors, who have different readings of it, and […] they are thus perceptive constructs’ (Paül & Trillo-Santamaria 2014: 16).

Herzog (1990, 1991, 2014; Herzog & Sohn 2014) and Martinez (1994b) cite significant turmoil and conflict between borderlanders and those outside of the border region who have influence over the way borderlanders live and work. Borderlanders may frustrate, bend and violate national laws, because they find such laws detrimental to their borderland situation. Similarly, while most successful cross-border projects need to be driven by actors at the local scale, such projects are directly impacted by funding decisions made by actors at higher scales, such as the European Commission in Europe (OECD 2013; Zimmerbauer 2011). Hence, the importance of including the context and various scales that influence and are influenced by border regions in what Paasi (2009, 2010) calls a dyadic relationship. Zimmerbauer (2011: 223) takes this view in emphasising ‘borders can be found in different contexts, borders, like regions, themselves, are not fixed but dynamic in time and space’.

Consideration of the scale of the border is central to understanding a region. According to Hansen (1977; 1981: 19), a border region is only said to exist within ‘proximity to an international boundary’. This means either that (1) political boundaries at other scales – particularly at the subnational scale – are not important and do not influence borderlanders to the same extent as international border regions, or that (2) they have been understudied. Hoover (1948: 216) argued that subnational boundaries have limited impact on economic flows: ‘the international boundary is the only important kind’. The lack of research on subnational boundaries (Strihan 2008) suggests that this is a common assumption. This thesis takes the position that despite a lack of research interest in subnational border regions, there are significant opportunities as well as challenges for cross-border collaboration. Although

---

7 Following calls for the “flattening” of human geography and the removal of scale from studies (Marston 2000; Marston, Jones & Woodward 2005), numerous arguments have been made as to the importance of including scale in analysis (see Collinge 2006; Jonas 2006; Leitner & Miller 2007; Swyngedouw 1997, 2004).
subnational boundaries may not impact economic flows, subnational border regions are very much *worthy* of further research attention, as they are *also* an important kind.

Following consideration of previous definitions and conceptualisations, a list of characteristics of border regions is proposed. They are areas:

- Where economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity to a political boundary;
- That are in a constant state of flux that social actors help influence at a variety of scales, both within and outside of the border region, which results in border processes and narratives;
- That exist in proximity to either national or subnational political boundaries;
- Which are heterogeneous and cannot be understood as 'primordial but rather situational and contextual' (Newman & Paasi 1998: 79).

These features are important when considering the most appropriate approach to studying border regions.

### 2.2 CROSS-BORDER COLLABORATION IN INTERNATIONAL BORDER REGIONS

Research interest in international border regions first peaked round World War I and World War II, focusing on how international borders form (Boggs 1940; Holdich 1916a, 1916b; Jones 1943, 1945). During this time, borders were treated as ‘physical and static outcomes of political decision-making processes, to be described as opposed to analysed’ (Newman 2006b: 145). During the period 1950 to 1980, interest in international borders, and political geography in a broader sense, has been described as ‘a moribund backwater’ (Newman 2002: 4), mainly due to the political processes following World War II (Newman 2002, 2006b; Teschke 2006). Since the 1980s, research on international borders, and specifically border regions, has enjoyed a renaissance (Newman 2006a; Sidaway 2011).

In recent times, border regions have been recognised as areas with significant potential for economic development, innovation and knowledge sharing (Johnson 2009; Perkmann 2003; Perkmann & Sum 2002; Tripl 2010; Van Gorp 2009). This has been strongly acknowledged particularly in the EU, where cross-border regions, referred to as Euregions, have been known to exist for many years (the *Euregio Maas-Rhine* border region covering parts of Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands is thought to have existed since 1965) (Scott 1999). These regions are an important aspect of the European Council’s objective to promote economic, social and territorial cohesion (Europe Direct 2013; Johnson *et al.* 2011; Medeiros 2010; Nilsson, Eskilssson & Ek 2010). As part of the INTERREG cross-border cooperation program, the European Council had three main objectives in encouraging the development of Euregions:
1. Increase political development in peripheral regions;
2. Develop cross-border infrastructure; and
3. Increase environmental protection, with the promotion of economic and social cohesion being of particular importance (Anderson, O’Dowd & Wilson 2003).

In 2013, the European Council amended the name of the EU cross-border program, calling each cross-border region a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC). The aims of the program saw little change beyond a focus on the EU 2020 strategy. Oliveria (2015: 342) has reported the ‘overall purpose of an EGTC is to further develop and broaden the common border areas towards improving connectivity, infrastructure, enhancing socio-economic and institutional integration promoting employment, reinforcing competitiveness and to promote territorial cooperation’.

Despite the significant resources that have been injected into the EU Euregion program, many of these cross-border regions have not been successful (outcomes of the current program are as yet unknown). Scott (1999) has recognised that, even in homogenous European border regions, the outcomes of cross-border initiatives have been limited. Further criticism has come from Paasi (2002b: 198), who states European cross-border regions are ‘regions in discourses’ or ‘regions on paper’ but are not yet ‘regions in social practice’. Trippl (2010: 154) maintains cross-border linkages ‘are more the exception than the rule’, which has been particularly the case in regions where political borders have been very rigid prior to nations becoming involved in the EU (Kolossov 2005; Topaloglou 2008). Despite Europe being considered ‘the world’s first post-modern form’ and providing ‘an excellent laboratory’ for studying cross-border activity (Johnson 2009: 177), it appears that limited genuine cross-border collaboration has been achieved.

Outside of Europe, the international borders in North America have been the most researched (Pisani, Reyes & García 2009). At the Mexico-United States of America [USA] border, Martinez (2008: 6) developed a categorisation of two types of border region citizen. This provides an important insight into the dynamics of the border region:

- National borderlanders – usually Anglo-American citizens who have limited need or interest in crossing the international boundary and have very limited links and interaction with Mexicans across the border.
- Transnational borderlanders – mainly Mexicans who have ‘built bridges that enhance and promote binational and bicultural symbiosis’, with many links across the international boundary.

---

8 An important argument that exists in this regard is the point that the political boundaries on the edges of the EU, such as those shared with Belarus, have become increasingly closed with the development of the supra-national region (Johnson et al. 2011; Marin 2011; Minghi 1994; Sidaway 2011).
This shows the importance of considering the views of borderlanders from various locations, as experiences and perspectives within a single border region can be distinctly different.

At both the Mexican-USA and Canada-USA borders, the NAFTA has intentionally minimised the trade barriers between the nations (Anderson & O’Dowd 1999), while paradoxically, crackdowns have occurred on security for entry into the USA (Ashby 2014). This process resulted in what Andreas (2003, 2005) has labelled the “Mexicanization” of the Canada-USA border, with the previously unsecured and friendly border between the nations becoming increasingly militarised and the passing of persons and goods burdensome (Andreas 2003). More recently, at the national scale, cross-border relations have received increasing interest from the governments of Canada and the USA (Government of Canada 2008; USA Government and Government of Canada 2011, 2012, 2013, 2015), which has the potential to significantly change the environment for the border region.

At this border, Brunet-Jailley (2000, 2006) found that despite the significant economic integration of the regions (particularly in the Detroit-Windsor region, where the border region population shares many similar aspects of life), economic development efforts both across the border and within each country were characterised by competition, including among different scales of government within each nation. This border region provides insights into the socially constructed nature of border regions, with decisions made in the broader environment (such as free trade agreements and security crackdowns) and at multiple scales (international, national and subnational) influencing borderlanders.

In other parts of the world, transnational agreements such as the Economic Community of West African States [ECOWAS] and Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] have been put in place. Despite these initiatives, collaboration across international borders in Africa and Asia has been shown to be limited (Brühlhart & Hoppe 2011; Henderson 2001; Khoman 1992; Timothy & Teye 2008). It appears that, globally, despite the expected benefits of cross-border collaboration, even in regions where a concerted effort has been made to establish stronger links among borderlanders, such outcomes have been uncommon. What is perplexing about this, given the argument borders are thought to be diminishing in a globalised world (Castells 1998; Giddens & Hutton 2000; Ohmae 1995), is understanding what challenges are limiting cross-border activity. Following an evaluation of the literature (Hills & Cairncross 2011), three themes became evident and are discussed in Sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.3.
2.2.1 **DIFFERING POLITICAL-ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS**

There is a significant body of literature focused on the operation of industries and how different types of organisations interact to create value. Models frequently cited in the literature focus on triple helix networks and clusters. Triple helix networks focus on how industry actors, supporting institutions (such as vocation training institutes and universities) and government actors work together. Research that uses this model is frequently focused on how innovation results from linkages between these organisations (Christie, Rowe & Pickernell 2009). The cluster model is also focused on how linkages between organisations result in a well-functioning regional industry. The cluster model refers to three types of actors: horizontal, vertical and lateral (Porter 2004). Horizontal actors are organisations that produce the core products of an industry (e.g. visitor information centres and accommodation providers), while vertical actors are industry actors that buy from and supply to the horizontal actors (e.g. linen cleaning services). Lateral actors are organisations that support industry actors ‘through the provision of expertise, infrastructure and funding’ (Royer, Festing, Steffen, Brown, Burgess & Waterhouse 2009: 7), and are discussed further below.

This thesis accepts the classification of the three actor types under the cluster model and defines industry actors in the broadest sense of the term. This means that industry actors are considered to include businesses, not-for-profit organisations and community organisations that provide core products to tourists, as well as buy from and supply to horizontal organisations, whether for profit or not. An example of an important horizontal actor that provides a core product to tourists without a profit incentive are visitor information centres, that can be funded by governments or business groups or entirely supported by volunteers. While not a business, such an organisation is an important actor in the system. Keeping in mind the importance of industry actors, this thesis is focused on lateral actors.

Lateral actors are particularly important in tourism (Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Hall & Jenkins 1995) and include governments, training and education providers, as well as not-for-profit organisations that support industries, such as chambers of commerce and industry associations (Christie *et al.* 2009). Educational institutions are particularly important lateral actors in the tourism industry, as they provide skilled labour to regional tourism markets, conduct research on local tourism issues (e.g. Lovelock & Boyd 2006), and develop strategy documents for tourism destinations (e.g. Dredge, Ford & Whitford 2011) and tourism projects (e.g. Derrett, Tiyce, Mackellar & St Vincent Welsh 2000). The way in which these lateral actors operate within and outside of their jurisdictional boundaries is an important component of cross-border collaboration, especially where more than one scale is involved.
The first challenge facing lateral actors in cross-border collaboration is the incompatibility of political-administrative systems. For example, on the German-Polish border, the German government has a more decentralised federal system that allows for, at least perceived, quicker decision making at the regional scales, whereas the Polish government has a more centralised system that requires decision making to be carried out in the country’s capital (Krätke 1999; Scott & Collins 1997). In a similar way, in the planning and construction of the Fehmarn Belt Fixed Link between Denmark and Germany, cross-border collaboration was made difficult due to the two country’s administrative structures meaning that some government officials did not have counterparts to directly deal with (Stöber 2011). Other issues at the Danish-German border include that government roles such as economic development and tourism are managed in different ways in each nation (European Union 2009). In a similar vein, at the German-French border, tourism destination management (Quack 2006) and governance more generally (OECD 2013) are treated quite differently in each nation, making cross-border collaboration more difficult. Collaborative efforts across the French-Swiss border have been hampered by frustration from Swiss Cantons, as they have had to wait for their French counterparts to work through the French multi-scale governance framework (OECD 2013). The changing nature of political systems in Eastern Europe has also seen issues of incompatibility between systems and a lack of interest from government elites to effectively work across borders (Marcu 2011).

Irrespective of the compatibility of the political-administrative structures in adjacent nations, numerous instances exist of lateral actors holding differing priorities and directions, leading to the failure of cross-border initiatives. In Europe’s Maas-Rhine Euroregion, while collaboration between the three nations exists, it has been found that issues remain. There is an unwillingness to change policies with a view to minimising differences between legislations across the border region; according to Hassink et al. (1994), the three nations were investing “scattered funds” that could be more effectively used if pooled and offered as large grants, and were reluctant to set clearly articulated, unified goals to achieve outcomes collectively. In the Greater Geneva region (which includes the French-speaking Canton of Geneva, Switzerland and adjacent areas of France), it has been said that the Swiss Confederation aims to reaffirm the importance of the canton by providing financial support for cross-border activity (Leresche & Bassand 1995), while the French Government only provides support in the form of the recognition of project goals (Herzog & Sohn 2014). It appears that numerous governments have paid lip service to cross-border collaboration while their actions were geared towards maintaining the existing political boundaries and the powers that come with them (Newman 2006b; Paasi 1996).

A similar issue exists in a region across three countries in Eastern Europe. The BUG region – which includes the border regions of Belarus, Poland and Ukraine – has been set up as a cross-national region for tourist visitation. Although this is a collaborative arrangement between the
regions, each country has very different tourism strategies, and it is difficult for tourists to cross from one country to another (Studzieniecki & Mazurek 2007). In studies on border regions in the USA, not only do the economic development strategies on each side of the Canada-USA border differ, but the organisations on each side of the border also compete with one another. Finally, the western Mexico-USA border region provides evidence of the instability of government agencies that can impact border regions. Following a period of interest in cross-border flows from the USA side of the border, ‘during the 1990s, tight budgets wiped out the two local border planning offices at the city and county levels’ in San Diego (Herzog & Sohn 2014: 450).

While contact across borders may be limited depending on individual citizens (Gelbman & Keinan 2007), the differing political-administrative systems in border regions result in regions adjacent to borders holding a liminal regulatory position. One of the most obvious outcomes of this liminality⁹ is that borderlanders are often ‘halfway populations […] caught within intervening space between normative frames of reference’ (Gelbman & Timothy 2011: 113). They often hold a state of “in-betweenness” due to living in “in-between spaces” (Bhabha 1994; Hollinshead 1998) or “fluid spaces” (Murdoch & Pratt 1997: 64), which can impact the extent to which borderlanders collaborate.

In the Egypt-Israel border region, because of differing legislation of gambling, there is significant recognition of tourism opportunities on one side of the border, while the other side recognises only the detrimental effects of the situation (Felsenstein & Freeman 2001). This has bred competition on each side of the border, with the establishment of casinos on the Israeli side of the border (Felsenstein & Freeman 2002). In a similar vein, the border region between Northern Ireland and Ireland has seen differences in liquor licensing laws¹⁰ on each side of the border, which has led to competitive behaviour between businesses and very little intention to collaborate due to a feeling of not being on a “level playing-field” (Newman 2006b). Wide-spanning regulatory differences are seen in many of the EU border regions. Although member states share certain laws and regulations, such issues as labour laws remain disparate across border regions. One case in point is the difference between the conditions of workers in Germany and many Eastern European countries, where collaboration across borders actually reinforces the differentials between the East and the West (Scott & Collins 1997). This issue has also been found in the Romania-Moldavian context, with the border having only recently been opened (Marcu 2011). ‘Different laws and institutional capacities’, as well as ‘different cultural

---

⁹ A term coined by van Gennep (1960), and then Turner (1980), that refers to in-between situations and conditions where actors are unsure of where they fit within an existing structure (Thomassen 2009).

¹⁰ The issue of liquor licensing across borders has also been recognised as an important social issue aside from cross-border collaboration, with the finding that the number of Detroit-Windsor border region drink-related driving incidents significantly increased with changes in establishment opening hours in Windsor, Ontario (Vingilis, McLeod, Seeley, Mann, Voas & Compton 2006).
views’ are also a complicating factor in ‘environmental preservation in borderland zones’ (Herzog 2014: 394; Pezzoli et al. 2014).

This dual-legislation environment means that ‘a location at a border is […] fraught with risk’ (Felsenstein & Freeman 2001: 511). Because of this, some borderlanders seek ‘recognition of their special needs by the authorities, often insisting that some laws have detrimental regional effects and must therefore be changed or enforced differently in border regions’ (Martinez 1994b: 13). Their calls often go unheard, on the one hand as a result of the peripheral situation of most border regions (discussed in Section 2.2.3), and on the other hand as they address issues that are politically sensitive at higher scales of government. Martinez (1994b: 13) makes the case that ‘many merchants and traders in particular come to think of themselves as members of a self-contained and self-directed border economic community rather than pure citizens of a nation-state whose behaviour must conform to strictly national norms’, causing resentment and driving some to work around laws.

Others have observed borderlanders sometimes resolve the liminal regulatory situation informally, despite such issues being the legal responsibility of higher scales of government, such as international relations agencies (Herzog 1991; Leimgruber 1989; Timothy & Teye 2004). In researching the health sector in the Baja California, Mexico and California, USA borderlands, Pezzoli et al. (2014) refer to local actors informally adapting and negotiating federal and state policies, in the same vein as Verbole’s (1999) tourism actors, ‘to meet the unique needs of the local and complex border communities’ (Pezzoli et al. 2014: 432).

2.2.2 Identity and othering

An emerging field of interest in the border literature is the relationship between regions, borders and identity. Identities are socially constructed and ‘often represented in terms of a difference between Us and Other, rather than being something essentialistic or intrinsic to a certain group of people’ (Paasi 1996: 18)11. This argument is supported by studies that have found that more links occur between businesses within nations than geographically closer businesses across international borders (Hassink et al. 1994; Kolossov 2005).

This “othering” at the international scale involves perceptions of citizens across the border. A prominent example of this is the differing perceptions that German organisations have of workers from different nations. In one study, Belarusians were thought to have a lower work ethic than Germans, while the nation’s direct neighbours in Poland were perceived as being

11 National identity has been found to be among the most important forms of identity to most individuals. At the same time, it needs to be granted that most individuals have numerous identities. For example, with the growth of the EU, it has been found that there has been an increase in citizens identifying as European, while there has been minimal decline in citizens also identifying with their nation (Lebow 2013; Paasi & Prokkola 2008).
more similar (Scott & Collins 1997). In the context of the Baltic region, it has been reported that government officials in some countries were suspicious of working with Finns, who were perceived as making ‘unscrupulous efforts to consider only Finnish interests’ (Paasi 1996: 80). A study on cross-border efforts between Denmark and Sweden characterised the regions as socially and culturally similar, but there were still feelings that ‘Danes often are perceived as more eager while Swedes strive for consensus’ and are more bureaucratic (Skäremo 2016: 29). Such perceptions have clear impacts on limiting collaborative efforts. One explanation as to why such perceptions exist and, in turn, impact cross-border collaborative efforts is the significant dissimilarities between the countries economically, socially, politically and culturally (Saint-Germain 1995; Scott 1998).

A standout example of why the problem is more complex than this is the Canada-USA border where – despite similarities culturally, socially, linguistically (to some extent) and politically – cross-border collaboration is limited and competitive behaviour is high (Brunet-Jailly 2006; Buursink 2001; Jayawardena, White & Carmichael 2008; McGreevy 1994). A further level of complexity regarding “othering” is the argument that individuals have multiple affiliations, meaning that identities in themselves are ‘fragmented, inconsistent and constantly evolving’ (Lebow 2013: 309). In the context of subnational border regions, an individual borderlander could potentially identify with numerous geographical areas including their nation, state, subregion, local government area and their border region. To follow Lebow’s (2013) logic, they are also likely to identify with numerous other groups such as professional groups, sports teams or religions. All of which are sources of “othering” behaviour.

2.2.3 AREAS ON THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PERIPHERY

Another aspect of border regions ‘is their peripheral location, relatively far from the core region of the country and its main cities’, which is compounded by thin population in many areas (Buursink 2001: 8). While not true in all areas, generally border regions are distanced from capital cities and only represent a small proportion of a nation’s population. This ‘commonly translates into political and socio-cultural marginality’ (Timothy 2000a: 62). Buursink (2001: 8) has made the argument that this situation is not assisted when, in some situations, powerful political decision makers in core regions may see border regions as not politically important. Thus, border regions are often ‘excluded from economic development programmes’ (Timothy 2000a: 62). Such a point is particularly relevant here in that tourism is often seen as an important form of economic development activity (Baker & Cameron 2008; Caldwell & Freire 2004; McIntosh, Goeldner & Ritchie 1995), which relies significantly on government intervention and assistance (Leiper 2004; Lickorish & Jenkins 1997; Wang & Xu 2014). A study in Switzerland has found that even development efforts driven by local borderlanders
can suffer from a lack of political attention and support from governments at higher scales (OECD 2013). This is not necessarily the case when political capitals are in border regions, such as Copenhagen, where political elites feel the effects of vicinity to a border on an ongoing basis (OECD 2013).

The situation in most border regions can have the effect of borderlanders often feeling dislocated and deprived by their respective government (House 1980; Martinez 1994b, 2008). As such, where cross-border activity does occur, external influences may have important impacts on the extent to which cross-border collaboration on specific initiatives, or programs, can be achieved. As discussed in Section 2.1, this is illustrated by the common situation of border regions that involves actors and activity ‘both inside and outside the regional process [...] with scale-crossing complexity’ (Paasi 2010: 2299).

As well as the state failing to support the potential of border regions (Johnson 2009; Perkmann 2003; Trippl 2010), border regions also face economic disadvantages. Hassink et al. (1994: 7), for instance, posit that regions on the edges of nation-states face limited expansion possibilities, ‘lopsided production systems’, and insufficient infrastructure to support many industries. Van Gorp (2009) agrees that, even in regions where cross-border interaction exists, border regions are often a long distance from other economically prosperous regions both across the border and within the same nation – limiting the level of spillovers attainable. The result of this is the tendency for border regions to have ‘economic structures that seem to consist of relatively slow growing industries’, as ‘industries that grow relatively fast prefer locations away from the border’ (Van Gorp 2009: 359). Nevertheless, some argue that this is changing because of increasing global integration, even making some border regions ‘important zones of wealth production’ (Herzog 2014: 394).

In considering the three key themes in Sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.3, some conclusions can be reached. On the one hand, borders exist less as lines on maps, but rather as processes that have scale-crossing complexity, as well as social, political and economic functions. On the other hand, while some of the points made within the literature regarding the characteristics and issues of collaboration in border regions may have some explanatory power for border regions globally, due to the diversity of border regions, it is a mistake to assume all border regions possess the same characteristics, challenges and issues (Martinez 2008; Newman 2006a; Paasi 2011).
2.3 **Conclusion**

This chapter aimed to be the first of two to **explore the issues associated with CBTM at an international scale and appraise their relevance in managing tourism in Australian subnational border regions** (Research Objective 1). In reviewing the history and literature on border regions, it became evident that the most appropriate approach to defining border regions is through a set of characteristics. Four key characteristics were apparent:

- Border regions are areas where economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity to a political boundary.
- Border regions are often in a constant state of flux that social actors help influence at a variety of scales, both within and outside of the border region, which results in border processes and narratives.
- Border regions exist in proximity to either national or subnational political boundaries.
- Border regions can be heterogeneous and cannot be understood as ‘primordial but rather situational and contextual’ (Newman & Paasi 1998: 79).

This work is a key starting point in developing a conceptual framework and research approach that acknowledges and leads to improving our understanding of border regions (see Chapter 4).

It was found that much of the research on cross-border collaboration was centred on border regions in Europe and North America. Despite some cross-border efforts having long histories and receiving significant support, it was apparent that various challenges impacted the success of attempts to work collaboratively across international borders. A synthesis of the literature found three key themes. These were differing political-administrative systems between nations, identity and “othering” between groups, and holding an economically and politically peripheral location in the minds of those not impacted by proximity to a border.

It is unclear, without further evidence, to what extent these challenges would be relevant; specifically, to tourism management, or to what extent challenges at the international scale would also be applicable in Australia’s subnational border regions. The following chapter deals specifically with the issue of tourism management in border regions before discussing the Australian context.
3 MANAGING TOURISM IN SUBNATIONAL BORDER REGIONS: A REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature in three key areas: tourism destination management, cross-border tourism management and cross-border tourism management in Australia’s subnational border regions. It is the second and final chapter aimed at exploring the issues associated with CBTM at an international scale and appraising their relevance in managing tourism in Australian subnational border regions. It begins by considering the various definitions of tourism destinations, reviewing the literature on regional tourism destination management, prior to turning to the issue of collaboration in tourism destination management. The second part of the chapter then considers border region tourism and cross-border tourism management. The chapter concludes by appraising the relevance of the existing literature in managing Australian subnational border regions and demonstrating the existence of a significant gap in our knowledge.

3.1 DEFINING TOURISM DESTINATIONS

In its simplest form, tourism involves the travel of people from their place of origin to a destination elsewhere. As such, ‘the destination lies at the very heart of travel and tourism systems’ (Fyall, Garrod & Tosun 2006: 75). The tourist destination is central to many of the founding theories in tourism studies including whole tourism systems (Leiper 1979, 1995, 2004), models of tourist behaviour (Jafari 1989; Plog 1974, 2001) and the tourism destination lifecycle (Butler 1980). Despite the central significance of the destination in tourism studies, ‘definition is a serious and continuing difficulty for analysts of tourism’ (Lickorish & Jenkins 1997: 1). While ‘destinations are a fundamental feature of tourism research […] work on the conceptual and theoretical foundation of destinations has been fragmented, incomplete, and without much general sense of direction’ (Pearce 2014: 1).

One approach to defining tourism destinations has been from a demand side perspective. According to Baker and Cameron (2008), for instance, a tourism destination is any place that attracts visitors for a temporary stay. The United National World Tourism Organization (2013a) takes a similar approach in considering that ‘the main destination of a tourism trip is defined as the place visited that is central to the decision to take the trip’. Selin (1993) has defined tourism destinations as the location of products that tourists use in a trip. Similarly, a tourism destination can be defined as ‘a geographic area containing a critical mass of development that satisfies traveller objectives’ (Gunn 1994: 27). Such definitions suggest a tourism destination is a geographical location that tourists visit, comprising components that satisfy their needs.
Saraniemi and Kylänen (2011: 134) have called this an ‘economic geography–oriented’ approach.

Taking a ‘marketing-management’ perspective (Saraniemi & Kylänen 2011: 135), Gnoth (2004: 2) has written about destinations as products, describing them as ‘a synergistically perceived experience of an attraction, facilitated by a number of heterogeneous services’. This considers the destination as being made up of several services, which are perceived as a whole from the tourist’s perspective. Gunn (1994) explains that all functioning tourist destinations include certain components including transportation, attractions, services, promotion and information. Such a conceptualisation supports the position of Leiper (2008) that tourism destinations are, at least partially, industrialised. These definitions also carry implicit assumptions about the scale of tourism destinations.

A tourism destination ranges in scale and the label can be used to describe anything from a continent, country, state, region, city, village or purpose-built resort (Bieger 1998; Hartmann 2006; Kotler, Bowen & Makens 2006; Pearce 2012; Pike 2004, 2008; Pike & Page 2014; Saraniemi & Kylänen 2011; Swarbrooke 2001; World Tourism Organization 2010). King (2002) argues, irrespective of the scale of the tourism destination, that the important feature for tourists is the ability of a location, whether a continent or a village, to fulfil the desired tourism experience requirements. Furthermore, King (2002: 108) posits that in an “experience economy”, tourism managers need to focus on the ‘relevance of the experience they offer the customer, rather than the destination they promote’. Saraniemi and Kylänen (2011: 136) refer to this perspective as the ‘customer-oriented’ perspective.

In an attempt to look beyond these specific views, Saraniemi and Kylänen (2011: 134) have offered a socioculturally constructed perspective of tourism destinations, by arguing that the tourism destination concept is complex, requiring for tourism destinations to be viewed from both business-oriented and sociocultural perspectives. In the model promoted by these authors, ‘production, consumption and the local community are entwined’, while tourism destinations are ‘not stable, closed systems but are under constant negotiation and renegotiation that connect to wider discursive frameworks and historical systems’. Such a perspective aligns with the argument that tourism destinations, like border regions, are most appropriately conceptualised as ‘not fixed but dynamic in time and space’ (Zimmerbauer 2011: 223). While this perspective has the most potential for understanding the realities of tourism management, and is accepted in this thesis, how tourism is currently defined, organised and managed by tourism actors in border regions is an important consideration in understanding opportunities and challenges.
### 3.2 Managing Regional Tourism Destinations

Despite the diversity of nations, states and other tourism destinations, the delimitation of tourism destinations from the supply perspective appears to have followed a fairly common approach, namely to use *a priori* regions (Beritelli *et al.* 2013; Pike & Page 2014). Smith (1990: 266) posits that the most common way of defining tourism destinations for management is to use the concept of *a priori* regions, which are ‘based on arbitrary or subjective perceptions as to the extent or character of the region’, with ‘political units, such as countries, states, and provinces’ being the most common. The primary focus of research into *a priori* tourism regions has been to determine the way in which tourism is most successfully managed to increase the competitiveness and sustainability of tourism destinations at a time when – driven by the macro-level shifts discussed in Section 1.1 – ‘competition for the travel dollar continues to intensify’ (King 2002: 107; cf. Fyall 2010; Marzano 2008; Parra-López & Calero-García 2009).

According to Swarbrooke (2001: 165), tourism destination management – while differing for each geographical scale – generally involves four main elements: planning and development, local impact management, operational issues and quality control, and marketing. Although agreeing on the main elements, Dredge *et al.* (2011a) are critical of an approach that considers local impact management separately from planning and management. Regarding this point, Swarbrooke (2001: 165) goes on to explain the ‘four elements are heavily interrelated’ and ‘are rarely managed, as a whole, by a single agency’.

Another model of destination management that has been advanced is focused on destination development, destination marketing and destination management activities underpinned by broad principles of sustainable development, good governance, inclusivity, rigorous planning and effective marketing and promotion (Dredge *et al.* 2011a). In detailing this model, Dredge *et al.* (2011a) have made explicit the importance of collaboration among government departments, as the three activities are not contained within the responsibility of a single person or group. When it is considered that private sector firms (Buhalis & Cooper 1998) and, in some cases, education and training organisations (Jackson & Murphy 2002; Michael 2003, 2007; Novelli, Schmitz & Spencer 2006) are also involved, the issue of tourism destination management becomes increasingly complex. This further increases the necessity for collaboration among all actors (Pike & Page 2014; Selin 1993).

---

12 A strong point made in the literature is that many government tourism agencies/departments are too exclusively focused on destination promotion and fail to give enough attention to the other activities (Baker & Cameron 2008; Beritelli *et al.* 2013; Bornhorst, Brent Ritchie & Sheehan 2010; Prideaux & Cooper 2002).
3.2.1 **Collaboration in Regional Tourism Destinations**

Numerous benefits of a collaborative approach to tourism destination management have been found to exist (Alonso 2010; Gibson & Lynch 2007; Gibson, Lynch & Morrison 2005; Lynch & Morrison 2007; Lynch, Halcro, Johns & Buick 2000; Morrison, Lynch & Johns 2004; Parra-López & Calero-García 2009). Leiper (2004, 2008) has listed 14 forms of tourism collaboration, while Dredge et al. (2011a) categorise the main benefits as competitive advantage, knowledge and information sharing, reducing inefficiencies, resource pooling and increasing resilience. These benefits flow as the approach responds to the complexity of tourism destination management involving marketing, infrastructure, planning and industry issues (Bramwell 2006; Hall 1999; Jamal & Jamrozy 2006; Pike & Page 2014).

Leiper et al. (2011: 56) have gone a step further in arguing that collaborative behaviour is not simply encouraged in tourism management, but ‘intrinsic in every strategically functioning tourism industry’. The authors have argued, based on various economic theories (Best 1990; Buckminster-Fuller 1972; Penrose 1959), that no industry operates without businesses being linked in some way. Links can include both global links (such as between international hotel chains and airlines) and connections at the regional destination scale (e.g. joint advertising). Others have made similar points in postulating that ‘collaboration in tourism, and specifically in destination branding, is not a strategic alternative for the destination but is essential and inherent to the nature of the tourism destination’ (Marzano 2008: 140). In a similar vein, Wilkinson and March (2008: 27) posit that tourism ‘is an industry characterised by high degrees of interdependency where the evolution or creation of collaborative relationships such as networks is more than a natural outcome; it is a managerial imperative’.

In the broader literature on policy and governance, many researchers see a need for collaboration and networked governance as a response to numerous factors in the environment (Ansell & Gash 2008; Donahue 2004; Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh 2012; Healey 2003, 2004; O’Flynn 2008; Shergold 2008; Wanna 2008). In line with this broader interest, tourism collaboration has been gaining interest among researchers and practitioners (Arnaboldi & Spiller 2011). Jamal and colleagues (Jamal & Getz 1995, 1999; Jamal & Jamrozy 2006) have led a significant part of the tourism collaboration research. In their work, these authors accept the definition of collaboration offered by Gray (1989: 236), who defines it as ‘[c]mergent organisational arrangements through which organizations collectively cope with the growing complexity of their environments’.

---

13 These factors include the increasing complexity of public policy issues (many challenges facing policy makers being larger than the authority of a single organisation) and the increasing use of outsourcing (Bressers, O’Toole & Richardson 1995; Donahue & Zeckhauser 2011; Eggers 2008; O’Leary 2014; O’Leary & Vij 2012).
In the broader literature on collaborative governance, this definition is among the most commonly used. Part of the reason for this is the broad applicability of a highly inclusive definition within what is a fragmented body of literature (Ansell & Gash 2008; Emerson et al. 2012). Following a review of previous studies, Emerson et al. (2012: 1-2) define collaborative governance as:

The process and structures of public policy decision making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished.

As this thesis focuses on governments and particularly collaboration among scales of government, this definition is useful in guiding the research. In the context of tourism destination management, Jamal and Getz (1995) recognise that one of the primary areas of growing complexity in the environment of tourism destinations is increasing globalisation (as discussed in Section 1.1). The authors also explain that the collaborative process has ‘five key characteristics’:

1. The stakeholders are interdependent;
2. Solutions emerge by dealing constructively with differences;
3. Joint ownership of differences is involved;
4. The stakeholders assume collective responsibility for the ongoing direction of the domain; and
5. Collaboration is an emergent process (Jamal & Getz 1995: 190).

Collaborative arrangements in tourism involve a variety of actors with an interest in tourism accepting one another’s differing perspectives in an emergent process with the aim of improving the situation for all involved. Importantly, while collaborative efforts often involve multiple perspectives and differences, they are driven by a shared vision (Lee & Chok 2005). While these characteristics are relevant to tourism destinations broadly, as discussed in Section 3.5.1, the extent to which actors in border regions hold these characteristics is not well understood. Wang and colleagues (2008b; Wang & Fesenmaier 2007) have dealt with the issue of the conditions under which collaborative tourism destination management occurs. According to them, for collaboration to occur, at least one precondition must exist and the actors must be motivated to collaborate. Theories have also been set forth to predict tourism networking success factors (see Table 3.1). Although useful in explaining the collaborative process, these theories do not fully incorporate the importance of the destination’s context and situation, which is an important aspect of research into collaboration in border regions (Gibson 2014; Newman & Paasi 1998).
Table 3.1 Networking Success Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Learning and exchange translates into perceived and tangible outcomes that provide social and economic gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Effective systems are in place that makes efficient use of business environments, social space and virtual cyber-space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Comprehensive understanding, manipulation and management of a diverse set of member economic, social and psychological motivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td>Membership represents a healthy balance and interplay of public agencies, academic institutions, and the private sector as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-organisational learning</td>
<td>Connects with a hub organisation, core participants and is stimulated by supportive infrastructure of formal and informal mechanisms, ultimately translating into commercial benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>A combination of hub organisation and network champion play catalytic roles that are stimulated and supported as appropriate to the life cycle of the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Clearly identified, articulated and communicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Aims are linked to local, regional, national and international priorities that are able to transcend issues that may deflect the driving purpose, achieving commercial outcomes as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing</td>
<td>Continuity of sufficient financial, human and physical resources as the network starts up and evolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Fit for purpose, recognises the benefits of the creation of communities of learning involving inter-connecting of a multi-tier pyramid of networks as appropriate, and supported by the public sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Gibson and Lynch (2007); Gibson *et al.* (2005); Morrison, Lynch and Johns (2002)

A further issue when considering collaboration in tourism is one to which Leiper (2008) has often referred. Many researchers have failed to recognise that collaboration does not always occur and it is a mistake to not recognise the place of competitive relations in tourism destinations (Dredge 2006a). This is an issue that Watkins and Bell (2002) have dealt with in proposing three forms of tourism business relationships (see Table 3.2).

An extension of this categorisation is the argument that each tourism organisation can hold several different links with other organisations. For instance, an actor may compete with actors in other destinations, but collaborate with other actors within the same region. In other cases, the actors may only compete (Buhalis 2006; Buhalis & Cooper 1998; Butler & Weidenfeld 2011). This supports the arguments in the border literature that a multiplicity of perspectives can exist within a certain border region (Paasi 2010; Rumford 2012).

Although there is general agreement in the literature that collaborative activity is important in the success of tourism destinations, researchers have taken differing approaches to understanding how organisations within destinations work together (Pearce 2014). For instance, labels given to activities involving individuals, stakeholders and government working together include terms such as *partnerships* (de Araujo & Bramwell 2002; Laing, Lee, Moore, Wegner & Weiler 2009; Pfueller, Lee & Laing 2011; Timothy 1999), *joint management* (Moore, Weiler,

Table 3.2 Dimensions of Business Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Immediate, often in response to competitor actions</td>
<td>Short to medium, often in response to industry initiated projects</td>
<td>Longer term, often in response to existing business arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Minimal and often distrustful of others</td>
<td>Low to medium; trust often placed more with organiser than with other cooperative players</td>
<td>High among immediate members; expect a shared outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Mostly to self</td>
<td>Generally low; relatively easy to pull out</td>
<td>Medium to high and formalised with commitment to results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Short-term, directly related to financial performance and easily measurable</td>
<td>Medium term, related to stimulating business and not usually immediately measurable</td>
<td>Longer term, related to securing business opportunities and not immediately measurable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Gains mostly limited to own organisation</td>
<td>Gains to participating organisations, some potential to wider region</td>
<td>Gains to participating members and/or the wider industry or region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Individual; some limited shared arrangements</td>
<td>Decisions often taken by strong individuals or small groups convincing others to follow</td>
<td>Shared decision making; consensus oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In some instances, the terms cooperation and collaboration are also used. A point often made is that cooperation is shorter term and less formal than collaboration (Donahue & Zeckhauser 2011; Gray 1989; Jamal & Getz 1995; Shergold 2008), although some simply see the two as synonymous (Beritelli 2011; Timothy & Teye 2004). In reviewing the work that has been completed in protected areas management it was concluded that, irrespective of the term used, generally the intention of the actors is the same – to work together to extract collaborative outcomes that are greater than individual efforts (Laing, Wegner, Moore, Weiler, Pfueller, Lee, Macbeth, Croy & Lockwood 2008), which is in keeping with the definition of Emerson et al. (2012) above.

Protected area management aims to manage and control a ‘clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values’ (Department of the Environment 2014b).
Excessive concern with labels given to organisations working together directs the attention away from the actual behaviours, activities and processes involved in their cooperation. It is significantly more useful to inform this thesis by considering a range of studies that consider the issue of tourism actors working together irrespective of the label used. Taking this broader approach, one soon finds that research in this area has been limited. In recent times, there have been calls for further research regarding tourism partnerships (Augusten & Knowles 2000), collaboration in tourism destinations (Wang & Fesenmaier 2007), tourism clusters (Michael 2003, 2007; Novelli et al. 2006) and tourism networks (Erkus-Öztürk 2009; Parra-López & Calero-Garcia 2009). Erkus-Öztürk (2009: 596) has argued that ‘networking practices have been moving forward, but studies that generate [an understanding of] them are emerging quite rarely’, claiming that ‘there is a need to confront this theory with practical evidence, although data collection is a very difficult task’. The difficulty of researching collaborative activity has also been underscored by Donahue (2004), who has maintained that cases need to be selected based on their contribution to theory generation, not on the ease with which they can be observed.

Daskalopoulou and Petrou (2010: 346) also support the point that research on tourism networks has been limited, while also positing that ‘the prevailing idea is that the highly competitive tourism sector is characterized by limited collaborative behaviours and less effective business networking’. This position conveys two important points. The first is that collaborative behaviour in tourism destinations is limited, while the other is the assumption that it is only tourism businesses that are involved in networking. In direct opposition to this point is the argument that tourism destination management needs to involve collaboration among government, industry and educational actors (Christie et al. 2009; Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Lickorish & Jenkins 1997). Lickorish and Jenkins (1997: 195) contend that tourism is an industry where the ‘co-ordinating role of the state is particularly important’, where at ‘the local level the regional or local authority has a similar role to that of the central government and in many ways a more comprehensive and important one’ (201). Although some tourism destinations would involve very little government involvement, in most cases destinations with a reasonably sized tourism industry and tourism demand would involve the government to some extent (Leiper et al. 2011). This confirms the importance of considering government actors, as well as actors from industry and educational settings in research on tourism collaboration in border regions.

A further consideration is the way in which each region is managed. In the United Kingdom, Regional Tourism Organisations [RTOs] exist within a single regulatory and political system, but operate in very different ways from the extreme of autocratic, top-down programs to a looser collaborative, bottom-up engagement (Fyall et al. 2009). As explained by Fyall et al.
Tourism destinations have been characterised as being managed through a process involving various actors, with differing interests, and political processes involving various scales within a unique context (Beritelli et al. 2013; Dredge 2001, 2006a; Lawrence 2009; Verbole 1999, 2000, 2003, 2009).

In considering the ‘wider environmental and political context’ (Fyall et al. 2009: 21) of border regions, the importance of collaboration is even more significant. The idea is that, while it may be possible for tourism destinations within existing political boundaries to function without collaboration, such as when a government agency simply promotes the activities in a region (Fyall et al. 2009), in the context of border regions, this is not possible. In the liminal setting of border regions, where existing political structures and scales meet (Timothy 2001; Timothy & Teye 2004), it is unlikely for government actors at higher scales to make the decision to promote a cross-border region without collaborative efforts at the local scale. Cross-border tourism destinations and brands will only come into existence as a result of cross-border collaborative activity, which constructs the new region (Oliveria 2015; Paasi 2010; Pasquinelli 2013; Pike 2013; Saraniemi & Kylänen 2011).

While the challenges specific to cross-border tourism are dealt with in Section 3.5.1, it is important to also consider the challenges that have been found to exist for collaboration in tourism destinations more broadly. This is because of the limited attention that cross-border tourism has received, but also because of the numerous challenges to collaboration that exist within political boundaries (Della Corte & Aria 2014; Naipaul et al. 2009). As can be seen in Appendix A, numerous studies have considered the challenges that exist in a range of contexts.

Table 3.3 provides an overview of the main themes that became apparent from the studies reviewed in Appendix A. It can be seen that numerous challenges to collaborative destination management have been found to be common to a variety of actor types. More specifically, trust, perceptions of inefficient resource use, contradictory values and a highly competitive perspective are the main concerns shared by actors both in industry and in government agencies. Furthermore, a top-down, autocratic approach to tourism destination management often involving one-way communication has been found to have a negative impact on collaborative activity, while collaboration among actors at the local scale has also been impacted by past experiences of working with other actors – both specifically in tourism initiatives.
(e.g. Wang 2008a) and on a broader, community level (e.g. Verbole 2000). This has been called ‘relationship baggage’ by Lovelock & Boyd (2006: 148).

Table 3.3 Overview of Challenges for Tourism Destination Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue or Barrier</th>
<th>Actor Type</th>
<th>Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust and concern of losing independence and flexibility</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Buhalis and Cooper (1998); Butler and Weidenfeld (2011); Della Corte and Aria (2014); Fyall and Garrod (2004); Grängsjö (2003); Saxena (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is too time-consuming or costly</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Fyall and Garrod (2004); Lade (2006b, 2010); (Pechlaner &amp; Tschurtschenthaler 2003); Wang (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly competitive perspective overrides a more collaborative outlook</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Grängsjö (2003); Jackson (2006); Jamal and Getz (1995); Selin (1993); Wang and Krakover (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictory value set or mistrust among actors</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Gibson and Lynch (2007); Saxena (2005); Wang and Fesenmaier (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-emphasis on top-down approaches and one-way communication</td>
<td>All actors (primarily local)</td>
<td>Dredge (2006a); Lawrence (2009); Selin (1993); Wang (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past experiences of working with other actors</td>
<td>All actors (primarily local)</td>
<td>Saxena (2005); Verbole (2000, 2009); Wang (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful local and distant actors (resource holders) misunderstand tourism or disagree on the use of resources</td>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>Dredge et al. (2011a); Selin (1993); Verbole (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political borders</td>
<td>Government agencies (primarily)</td>
<td>Dredge (2006a); Fyall and Garrod (2004); Lade (2006b, 2010); Selin (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited capacity to work collaboratively</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Dredge (2006a); Lade (2006b, 2009); Pechlaner and Tschurtschenthaler (2003); Wang (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the best interest of firms to collaborate</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Leiper et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of free-loading and sharing knowledge</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Jamal and Getz (1995); Lade (2006b, 2010); Wang (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myopic, short-term thinking predominates</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Macchiavelli (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness, disinterest in or no motivation to collaborate</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Buhalis and Cooper (1998); Butler and Weidenfeld (2011); Erkus-Öztürk (2009); Wang (2008a); Wang and Fesenmaier (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research from analysis of Appendix B. Sources cited within.

The barriers for industry actors involved in collaboration in a tourism destination are varied and, in a way, contradictory. In some cases, a lack of collaboration has resulted from actors having limited capacity (resources) to network with other organisations. Other studies have found, however, that the main issue is that industry actors have the capacity but choose not to be involved in collaborative activity as they are not interested, unwilling or simply lack the motivation (Buhalis & Cooper 1998). A partial explanation for this could be that some firms simply do not perceive benefits from this form of collaborative effort as they are not strictly part
of the partially-industrialised tourism industry (Leiper et al. 2008) while others may hold a highly competitive perspective, viewing collaboration as an activity that assists their competitors. It may not be the case for all industry actors in a region as some businesses rely exclusively on tourism. A potentially linked issue is the concern industry actors have in terms of collaborative effort resulting in free-riding and losing the competitive advantage that comes from withholding knowledge (Wang 2008b).

Three main barriers to collaboration that have been found to exist primarily among government actors were disagreement and frustration among actors who influence tourism destinations or directly impact the resourcing available to regions but who do not understand or are disinterested in tourism. The second, interrelated, barrier is the effect of a variety of actors at different government scales mitigating any form of collaboration through disagreement and stifling the efforts made at other scales. Such issues are potentially exacerbated in situations like Australia’s, because of federal structures and the constitutional separation of power (which will be discussed in Section 3.5.3). Finally, the literature shows that political borders have an important impact on the functioning of tourism destination management.

### 3.3 Tourism in Border Regions

An increasingly common claim in the literature is that tourism operates independently of political boundaries as tourists, in most cases, have the option to choose which locations they visit (Naipaul et al. 2009; Timothy 2001). With respect to international travel, it has been found that it is particularly common for tourists travelling long distances to visit more than one country, often triggering cross-border activities in some form; including passing through customs, presenting travel documents and undergoing visa control (Elliot & Johns 1993; Hwang & Fesenmaier 2003; Teye 1988; Tideswell & Faulkner 1999). With increasing mobility, this trend in international travel is continuing to grow (World Tourism Organization 2014).

### 3.4 The Attraction of Border Regions

While most international travellers are involved in some form of border processes, despite never actually entering a geographical border region, regions adjacent to border regions can hold qualities that attract tourists (Timothy 2001). The tourist attractions and activities associated with borders and border regions include the following.

*Cross-border shopping.* Several motivational factors are said to exist for people to cross borders for shopping, from favourable exchange rates to more flexible shopping hours and the availability of a wider range of different products (Bygvrå 1998; Castano et al. 2010; 15 With politically sensitive, closed political borders being an important exception.
Lord et al. 2008; Nielsen 2002; Romero-Jordán, García-Inés & García 2011). In a broader sense, due to differing regulations, examples exist of travellers using airports and flights out of neighbouring countries, such as Canadians flying out from USA airports (Sydney Morning Herald 2012) and USA citizens flying out of Mexico (Witz 2014), to minimise travel costs resulting from higher fees and taxes. This cross-border phenomenon is particularly impacted by fluctuations in foreign exchange rates, evident in such locations as the Canada-USA border (CBC News 2014b). Fuel prices have also been shown to influence fuel tourism (Banfi, Filippini & Hunt 2005).

**Gambling.** This border region tourism attraction is common in locations where a casino has been built on one side of the boundary and attracts tourists from the neighbouring state or nation, especially if in that neighbouring state or nation gambling is out-lawed (Bowman 1994; Felsenstein & Freeman 2001, 2002; Smith & Hinch 1996).

**Alcohol tourism.** As with gambling tourism, tourists travel across borders when drinking age regulations are different between the two sides, but also when regulations are enforced differently on each side of the border (Bowman 1994; Timothy 2000a). Differences in establishment licensing on each side of a border can also influence border region alcohol tourism (Vingilis et al. 2006).

**Sex/prostitution tourism.** This relates to two main factors: (1) many citizens moving to borderlands with limited employment availability and (2) visitors finding overseas ‘dens of iniquity’ (Timothy 1995: 59). Differences in regulation, law enforcement and the economic circumstances of different nations also influence the prevalence of this form of tourism (Bowman 1994; Robinett 2013).

**Medical tourism.** An area that has been growing significantly in the past decade is medical tourism, which sees people travel overseas to undergo medical procedures (Lunt, Smith, Exworthy, Green, Horsfall & Mannion 2009), for numerous different reasons including lower costs (Kingsbury, Crooks, Snyder, Johnston & Adams 2012).

**Border experience/border as an attraction.** Some tourists travel to border regions to experience political borders. This is mainly because few people experience what are common living conditions for borderlanders (Butler & Mao 1996; Guo 2015). Landmarks and border-related tourist attractions are seen at many political scales and locations, including at political borders that no longer exist (e.g. Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain) (Gelbman 2010; Gelbman & Timothy 2010; Timothy 1995, 2001) as well as in locations where borders remain heavily fortified, such as at the Korean Demilitarised Zone (Sydney Morning Herald 2013) and the

---

16 As with other border activities, this difference in regulation, economic environment and the enforcement of duties for products crossing the border are a significant cause for competitive rivalry in the retail sector in border regions (CBC News 2014a).
security fence dividing Israel and the Palestinian Authority (Gelbman 2016). So strong is the interest in border experiences for some that contrived tourist attractions have been developed to provide the experience of illegally crossing borders, such as Parque EcoAlberto in Mexico (Zhorov 2013). Some borders also provide tourists with acted spectacles that only exist due to the border (e.g. the daily ceremony at the Wagah Border between India and Pakistan) (Clark 2015). Tourists frequently photograph borders, even when limited evidence of the border exists (see Plate 3.1).

Plate 3.1 Tourists at Borders

![Tourists Straddling the Border in Derby Line, VT, USA and Stanstead, QC, Canada](image1)

![Swiss Tourists Photographing the England-Scotland Border Region](image2)

Source: Byrnes (2013); Williams (2009)

*Enclaves/exclaves*17. Enclaves and exclaves can be tourist attractions for the same reasons as political borders: they provide unique experiences that do not exist for those who live in contiguous states (Gardner 2005; Gelbman & Timothy 2011).

*Nature-based tourism.* Because of a range of factors, including the peripheral nature of border regions (Buursink 2001) and the under-development of frontier zones (Van Gorp 2009), many borderlands have maintained natural assets that make them attractive tourist destination regions (Butler 1996, 2002). An extreme case of the influence of political decisions on the natural attractiveness of borderlands is the establishment of a shared environmental protection area

---

17 An enclave is a region whose geographical boundaries lie entirely within the boundaries of another nation (e.g. the Republic of San Marino and Vatican City, within Italy), while an exclave is a region legally or politically attached to another territory with which it is not physically contiguous (e.g. Nakhchivan Autonomous Republic, which is an exclave of Azerbaijan and borders Armenia, Iran and Turkey) (Gelbman & Timothy 2011).
between the conflicting nations of Peru and Ecuador, to overcome the disagreement over where the border lies, which is allowing for the environmental regeneration of the region (Zbicz 1999). Other examples involve nations divided by a geographical feature, such as a mountain range (the Pyrenees mountains dividing France and Spain) or a river (the Rio Grande dividing Mexico and the USA), which function as a political border as well as a tourist attraction.

Despite the extensive list of border-related activities and characteristics that attract tourists, many border regions may be visited for reasons other than their inherent attractiveness as a border region. Examples exist of locations where experiencing the border or attractors related to the border are secondary to other aspects that appeal to tourists. Examples include Niagara Falls situated on the mainly friendly Canada-USA border (Brooker & Burgess 2008; Eagles 2010; Jayawardena et al. 2008; McGreevy 1994), Victoria Falls located at the sometimes restrictive Zambia-Zimbabwe border (Arrington 2010) and the Preah Vihear Temple situated in the disputed borderlands between Thailand and Cambodia (Cuasay 1998; Silverman 2010).

While these regions may have some attractiveness for their border context, the main attraction would have touristic merit without this border context and may actually have a higher attractiveness for risk adverse travellers who are unwilling to travel to areas of conflict. It would be expected that in most cases that subnational borders may have limited touristic value in terms of border aspects, but may attract tourists for other reasons. Irrespective of the reason why tourists visit a border region, the unique context of border regions results in a unique tourism management situation.

### 3.5 Managing Border Region Tourism Destinations

The various tourism contexts of borders and border regions are diverse and, in many cases, strongly relate to borderlanders – in both their capacity as tourists and as tourism providers – using the opportunities available due to their frontier location (Cuevas, Blasco & Timothy 2016; House 1980; Martinez 1994a; Timothy & Gelbman 2015). This diversity of contexts supports the importance of investigating the various scales that impact border regions, with national and state regulation and law enforcement forming an important aspect of many of the tourism opportunities in border regions. Even in border regions where none of these border region activities or attractions exist, an important consideration is the impact that the location of a political border within a region has on the management of the region. Swarbrooke (2001: 160), taking a largely marketing perspective, has made this point regarding the way in which tourism is managed in most parts of the world:

> tourists often view places as a single destination that are not seen as such by local government. **Bureaucratic boundaries are immensely important to governments but are largely irrelevant to the tourist.** This often leads to the public sector bodies that
market destinations doing so in ways which do not match tourist perceptions of the geographical extent of the destination, which limits the effectiveness of such marketing (emphasis added).

Quack (2006: 85) supports this point, in the context of Western Europe, arguing that ‘the borderlines of tourist destinations are not oriented to customers’ tourism perceptions, but rather to political boundaries. In the same vein, Dredge (1999: 781-2) suggested ‘planners […] are sometimes accused of narrowly focusing upon inappropriate geographical boundaries’, while ‘markets and destinations are interdependent and must be considered as part of any destination planning exercise’. More recently, it has been observed that:

Generally, visitors will define a destination quite differently from industry or from government agencies. Visitors have no particular interest in the administrative boundaries that shape the flow of money and other resources to support destination planning, marketing or management activities. They are more likely to define a destination region in terms of the attractions visited, travel time, the services needed and consumed, and the entry and exit points that define their travel (Jenkins, Dredge & Taplin 2011: 24).

In reviewing the literature on DMOs, Pike and Page (2014: 204) recognised a similar theme in the literature over the past four decades. They argued the conflict between the supply side perspective – which ‘is defined by a political boundary, ranging from a continent, a country, a state, a province, to a city or even a specific micro scale place’ – and the demand side perspective, where tourists will have their own perception of a destination often as ‘a geographic space in which a cluster of tourism resources exist’ (204). The authors go on to emphasise that a visitor’s ‘intended destination could be a precinct within a political boundary (e.g. Surfers Paradise within the city of the Gold Coast, Australia), a political boundary (e.g. the State of QLD, Australia), or cut across conventional political boundaries and/or be located along a touring route (e.g. the South Pacific)’ (204).

One of the few studies to focus on tourist perception of tourist destinations has provided empirical support for the widely held assumption that tourists perceive tourist destinations differently from the way that they are usually managed. An exploratory study of tourists in New Zealand confirmed visitors are attracted to certain attractions and rarely think about the boundaries of the administration managing different regions. An example given in the study is that of natural attractions near urban centres, where the natural attractions (in this case ski fields) may be managed by an entity different from the urban centre where the tourists stay; nonetheless, the tourists see the two regions as a single experience and have no reason to question whether the two regions are managed separately (Pearce & Schänzel 2013, 2015).
Due to the limitations of managing tourism within political borders and the difficulty of the tourism industry in border regions to connect to tourist experiences and, in turn maintain competitiveness (King 2002), Beritelli et al. (2013) and Blasco (2013) have called for tourism to be managed strategically across political borders (discussed further below). Such calls have been common across international boundaries in Europe (Studzieniecki & Mazurek 2007; Tosun, Timothy, Parpaires & Macdonald 2005), South-East Asia (Henderson 2001), North America (Timothy 2000b) and Africa (Teye 1988). Further calls have been made by researchers who argue the importance of cross-border tourism as a starting point in improving relations between nations, which have experienced conflict in the past (Butler & Mao 1996; Gupta & Dada 2011; SAYA 2012; Sönmez & Apostolopoulos 2000; Timothy 2013; Timothy, Prideaux & Kim 2005; Webster & Timothy 2006).

In borderlands with a limited history of conflict, based on the work of Gelbman and Timothy (2011), Paül and Trillo-Santamaria (2014) argue increased tourism collaboration across borders allows for a border region to effectively market the entire area. A study of tourism in the Øresund region also found an appetite for cross-border tourism between Denmark and southern Sweden due to expectations of marketing a large area to reach distant markets and become a stronger brand on the international market. There was also appeal among actors to leverage the already strong Copenhagen brand. Collaborative efforts were particularly strained, however, in 2016 when Sweden exercised increased border controls due to concerns over the influx of migrants (Skäremo 2016). This, once again, reinforces the multi-scale nature of tourism management in border regions.

Despite the potential for cross-border tourism, the most prominent researcher in the area, Timothy (2000b: 120), states that ‘cross-border management has been virtually ignored by tourism scholars’. More recently, Sofield (2006: 103) noted that ‘there are very few [studies] that specifically examine the role of borders in tourism’, while Haugland et al. (2011: 278) reported that ‘inter-destination bridge-ties are not well understood’. Similarly, ‘research concerning the host community’s own views on the local socio-political and economic effects of cross-border tourism remains a gap in our understanding’ (Gupta & Dada 2011: 42).

In arguing the importance of neighbouring small political units cooperating to minimise costs, share resources and develop more globally competitive regions in a time of high uncertainty, Naipaul et al. (2009: 463-4) have made the point ‘very few studies have been undertaken to explore how neighbouring small destinations with limited products and resources can collaborate in marketing their destinations’. The authors go on to argue ‘progress to date on achieving collaboration has been somewhat slow, anecdotal and fragmented’. Others have made similar claims in relation to regional branding and marketing (Nguyen 2014; Oliveria 2015; Pasquinelli 2013; Skäremo 2016). A further argument is that of the limited research conducted...
on cross-border tourism; much of it has been limited to certain contexts, particularly in Europe and the USA, with other contexts being in urgent need of investigation (Yang & Peng 2012). Much of the research is also limited to investigating actors at a single scale, particularly actors within DMOs.

The most well-known and highly cited model in tourism management in border regions is that of Timothy (1999), holding similarities to the border region models of Martinez (1994b) and the OECD (2013: 39) in recognising that tourism management in border regions ranges along a continuum from actors on each side of a border being completely alienated to being completely integrated (see Figure 2.1). Each categorisation has been defined in the following ways (Timothy 1999: 184-5):

- **Alienation** – ‘no partnerships exist between contiguous states’ as the region is incompatible politically or culturally’.
- **Coexistence** – ‘neighbouring nations tolerate each other, or they coexist, without any great deal of harmony’.
- **Cooperation** – ‘characterised by initial efforts between adjacent jurisdictions to solve common problems’.
- **Collaboration** – ‘occurs in regions where binational relations are stable and joint efforts are well established’.
- **Integration** – ‘integrated partnerships are those that exist without boundary-related hindrances, and both regions functionally merge’.

This model, while commonly accepted in the literature, has limited analytical capacity when it is considered that border regions are much more complex than such a categorisation would lead a reader to believe. Border regions ‘condition and are conditioned by politics, culture, economics, governance, and power relations’ among actors both within and outside of the region ‘with scale-crossing complexity’ (Paasi 2010: 2297). Furthermore, it is known that more than one tourism network can exist within a region (Dredge 2001, 2006a, 2006b; Dredge et al. 2011a) and that some actors have significantly more involvement in collaborative efforts than others (Leiper et al. 2011; Leiper et al. 2008). Herzog and Sohn (2014: 446-7), in a similar line of reasoning as Paasi (2010), contend that rather than attempting to define border regions through over-arching classifications, it is more worthwhile to consider ‘borders are “dynamic institutions” where functions inherited from state institutions are contested and reinterpreted through daily activities […] at different levels of social action’. Tourism ‘destinations are not stable, closed systems, but are under constant negotiation and renegotiation

---

18 With some actors belonging to numerous networks at once (Lebow 2013)
that connects to wider discursive frameworks and historical systems’ (Saraniemi & Kylänen 2011: 6).

3.5.1 **INTERNATIONAL CROSS-BORDER TOURISM MANAGEMENT**

Timothy (1999) used the continuum of cross-border partnerships (see Figure 3.1) to analyse three cross-border international parks along the Canada-USA border. It found that the three case studies ranged from cooperative to collaborative relationships, with none of the case studies found to have absolutely no border hindrances. These findings would suggest that CBTM, while not completely integrated, is highly developed. However, the situation of a managed national park is quite different to the *dynamic, complex and negotiated* situation of a border region, which involves a diversity of actors, attractions, regional images and government scales.

![Figure 3.1 Levels of Cross-border Tourism Partnerships](image)

Source: Timothy (1999: 185)

In a more recent study, Timothy and Teye (2004) considered the broader issue of CBTM in explaining that cooperation across international borders can exist at four main scales, and that all of them can directly or indirectly involve tourism management. The highest scale is that of global alliances (e.g. the United Nations and the World Tourism Organization), followed by regional alliances (e.g. ASEAN and EU), and then binational cooperation (e.g. Switzerland promoting tourism in Liechtenstein). The lowest scale of cooperation is said to be the inter-local. The authors argue that, at this scale, cooperation is often most successful, due to ‘fewer bureaucratic obstacles to hinder cross-border relations’ (Timothy & Teye 2004: 588). Furthermore, the authors refer to the work of Hansen (1983) and Bufon (1994) in arguing that inter-local cross-border cooperation is often the initiation point for further international cooperation at other scales. This appears to be supported by border studies showing that grassroots cross-border initiatives have the highest chances of success at international boundaries (Brunet-Jailly 2000, 2006; Zimmerbauer 2011). Numerous authors have also argued the value of grassroots cross-border tourism projects as a starting point in the pursuit of peace between nations (Gelbman 2008, 2010; Gupta & Dada 2011; Moore 2012; SAYA 2012). While this ‘inter-local’ cooperation is reportedly the most likely to succeed, exactly what this involves is not well understood and appears to miss the significance of the scale-crossing nature and the multitude of actors involved in cross-border activity (Paasi 2010).
The review of CBTM studies in Appendix C shows that existing research has tended to focus on either the EU, as the border region laboratory (Johnson 2009; Knippenberg 2004), or in international border regions in sensitive political contexts. A result of this focus has been that, significant barriers and issues have been found to exist for CBTM at international boundaries, over and above those that exist in collaborative tourism management efforts. The main issues and barriers are summarised in Table 3.4. In the EU studies, there is widespread concern that cross-border programs, because they are government-led and approached in a top-down way, are perceived by industry as too bureaucratic and not worthy of involvement. This has been found to be an issue not only in broader consideration of EU Euregions, where it has resulted in limited buy-in from industry (Scott 1999; Scott & Collins 1997), but also in collaborative tourism management more generally (Section 3.2.1). Border region histories were a challenge in some European regions, such as in the northern German-Poland border region, where certain issues linger from World War II. However, they have had the opposite effect in some European cases where borderlanders share a common identity (e.g. the Skärgården Archipelago, between Sweden and Denmark) (Nilsson et al. 2010).

In the context of politically sensitive international border regions, border region histories can have a significant impact on the political will of actors (both locally and in the political core of a nation) to genuinely engage in CBTM. This can be seen in the political decision to work more collaboratively at a binational or inter-local scale only for political sensitivities, political instability, and such basic issues as the movement of tourists across borders to make CBTM implausible. While not explicitly stated in much of the empirical analyses, with the exception of Wachowiak (2006) and Zbicz (1999), a possible explanation of such a contradictory situation lies in the fact that border regions (Chen 2005; Paasi 2010, 2011) and regional tourism destination management (Dredge 2006a; Verbole 2000, 2009; Wang & Krakover 2008) involve multiple actors and political scales within and outside the region. Such findings support the arguments of Herzog (1991), House (1980) and Martinez (1994b) that borderlanders attempt to avoid higher political scales when working collaboratively.

Issues that appeared common to CBTM at international borders included actors on either side of the border having differing tourism strategies and priorities, difficulties in developing tourism in “uneven” socio-economic or tourism development landscapes, and working across differing administrative structures and systems. The need for funding for cross-border projects from at least two different governments is a concern for tourism actors in border regions. This is not helped by perceptions of actors at the core of nations who see borderlands as marginal and not worthy of assistance, or simply not politically important (Buursink 2001; Cameron 2014; Timothy 2000a).
Table 3.4 Overview of Barriers to Cross-border Tourism Destination Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue or Barrier</th>
<th>Actor Type</th>
<th>Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differing tourism strategies/priorities across the border</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Cameron (2014); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004); Lovelock and Boyd (2006); Naipaul et al. (2009); Studzieniecki and Mazurek (2007); Timothy and Teye (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of losing decision making power/territorial control</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Bieger, Beritelli and Laesser (2009); Timothy (2000b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive traditions/rivalry for tourism and economic development</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Buursink (2001); Felsenstein and Freeman (2001); Goetz and Kayser (1993); Gordon (2007, 2009); Nguyen (2014); Nguyen and Pearce (2015); Wang (2008a); (Wang et al. 2013); Wilkinson and March (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing levels of socio-economic/tourism development across the border</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Buursink (2001); Cameron (2014); Henderson (2001); Nguyen (2014); Nguyen and Pearce (2015); Timothy (2000b); Timothy and Teye (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histories of conflict/war</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Henderson (2001); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004); Nilsson et al. (2010); SAYA (2012); Tosun et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties for tourists crossing borders</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Gupta and Dada (2011); Henderson (2001); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004); Skåre (2016); Studzieniecki and Mazurek (2007); Teye (1988); Timothy and Teye (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological/cultural division at the border (often due to language)</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Ioannides, Nielsen and Billing (2006); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004); Nilsson et al. (2010); Skåre (2016); Timothy (1995, 2000b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that the individual region image will be degraded/lost</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Cameron (2014); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and distant politics and personalities</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Lovelock and Boyd (2006); Tosun et al. (2005); Wang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources for any collaborative activity</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>Naipaul et al. (2009); Paül and Trillo-Santamaria (2014); Tosun et al. (2005); Wang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political instability</td>
<td>All actors</td>
<td>SAYA (2012); Teye (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact of cross-border collaboration on constituents</td>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>Gordon (2009); OECD (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing administrative and funding structures across the border</td>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>Bieger et al. (2009); Buursink (2001); Cameron (2014); Henderson (2001); Ioannides et al. (2006); Nguyen (2014); Nguyen and Pearce (2015); Quack (2006); Studzieniecki and Mazurek (2007); Teye (1988); Tosun et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of international treaties, concessions and treaty waivers</td>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>Timothy (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of buy-in/support from all scales of government</td>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>Paül and Trillo-Santamaria (2014); Wachowiak (2006); Zbic (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power imbalances</td>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>Skåre (2016); Wang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs are government-led, top-down and too bureaucratic</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Ioannides et al. (2006); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research from analysis of Appendix C. Sources cited within.

Finally, in most international border regions, CBTM efforts seem to be hampered by the psychological and cultural divisions that occur at even the most open of borders. While partly explained by the border region history between previously conflicting neighbours (Lagiewski & Revelas 2004; Nilsson et al. 2010; SAYA 2012), this is also an issue said to exist due to differences of culture and particularly language barriers between borderlanders (Ioannides et al.
2006; Timothy 1995, 2000b). It can also result from competitiveness among borderlanders and ‘lopsided’ government ‘agendas and policies […] perceived to be limiting tourism industry operations’ (Arrington 2010: 785). These policies and agendas often mean border regions are perceived as suiting different markets or that some regions simply do not have anything to offer tourists (Cameron 2014).

A particularly perplexing border region tourism destination to consider, and one of the most visited in the world (Matthews 2011), is that of the neighbouring cities of Niagara, Ontario, and Niagara, New York. The Niagara Falls sit on the international border between Canada and the USA, two regions which share similar levels of development, similar cultures, a similar language (to an extent), similar population sizes and similar histories (Buursink 2001; McGreevy 1994). Despite the various similarities, tourism and the competitive rivalry that tourism creates are the main reasons for the adjacent regions not working collaboratively (Brunet-Jailly 2006; Buursink 2001). In recent times, this rivalry appears to have increased with concerns that one side was more competitive than the other due to the earlier introduction of casinos. As testament to these competitive values, following political jostling by borderlanders at higher scales within their own nation, gambling became a source of further competition when casinos were eventually built on both sides of the border (Jayawardena et al. 2008). Evidence of the lack of research on CBTM in the Niagara region is highlighted by studies on networking behaviour in the region that fail to consider the border or the region across the border (e.g. Brooker & Burgess 2008; Telfer 2001).

A review of the fragmented literature on CBTM at international borders soon reveals that, despite the potential benefits and the logic of border regions working more collaboratively, numerous challenges exist. Solutions have been devised (e.g. Beritelli et al. 2013; Blasco 2013; Nguyen & Pearce 2015; Wang et al. 2013), but successful strategies and recommendations are few and far between. A greater number of successful solutions could have been put in place if the existing problems had been properly defined and understood. As it turns out, most recommendations, apart from being highly prescriptive, are insensitive to the bordering processes, politics and the multi-scale nature of cross-border tourism. To use the terminology of Rittel and Weber (1973), the issue of CBTM has been primarily approached as being a tame problem that can be easily defined and solved (Batie 2008). Instead, CBTM is a wicked problem.

In contrast to tame problems, wicked problems are characterised as being difficult to define and involving multiple interdependencies. They are multi-causal, unstable, socially complex, and rarely sit within a single organisation’s responsibility. They involve changing behaviour, often have no clear solution and commonly involve chronic policy fatigue (Australian Public Service Commission 2007; Phi, Dredge & Whitford 2010; Rittel & Webber 1973). In considering the
challenges evident in the literature, CBTM is clearly a wicked problem, involving ‘multiple actors with diverse goals’ (Phi et al. 2010: 1), often with limited consensus (Rumford 2012). Not only do these actors find themselves ‘facing the challenge of overcoming problems which are not clearly articulated’ but the ‘relationships and interdependence of these problems are very difficult to identify’ (Phi et al. 2010: 2). Despite being considered in some policy settings, wicked problems have hardly been mentioned in the tourism literature (Dredge, Lamont, Ford, Phi, Whitford & Wynn-Moylan 2010).

Law (2004; 2007: 595) has made the point that while ‘the world is largely messy’, researchers have attempted to make ‘the world clean and neat’, resulting in a situation where ‘contemporary social science methods are hopelessly bad at knowing that mess’ 19. In terms of the problem at the core of this thesis, while the methods, rules and frameworks from different social science disciplines have helped to produce the reality we understand, the weaknesses and flaws in these frameworks have produced “black spots” in our understanding (Dredge, Jenkins & Whitford 2011c). Given the wicked nature of the problem of CBTM, this thesis aims to analyse the issue using an approach that seeks to uncover the various perspectives of the diversity of interconnected actors (Christie et al. 2009; Rumford 2012; van Bueren, Klijn & Koppenjan 2003; Weber & Khademian 2008) in a unique border region context to better understand the messiness of the phenomenon and to develop realistic solutions to the problem.

### 3.5.2 Subnational Cross-border Tourism Management

Despite their growing importance (Eagles 2010), ‘borders and border regions are remarkably poorly understood’ (Alm & Burkhart 2013: 48). If this is the case of international border regions, it can be said that subnational border regions are even more poorly understood. The main reason for this lack of research appears to be the assumption that subnational borders are less important than their international counterparts. One of the few studies to consider cross-border collaboration at the subnational scale argues that ‘regional borders take on multiple meanings, unlike most international borders’ (Strihan 2008: 540). In some situations, such as in Belgium (where Strihan’s study was focused), Switzerland and Canada, subnational regions can be just as heterogeneous as two nations, sometimes sharing very little culturally or linguistically. Newman and Paasi (1998: 197), who have spent much of their careers investigating international boundaries in Europe and, to a lesser extent, the Middle East, have acknowledged:

19 Furthermore, situations involving numerous scales are in particular need of a messy research approach (Jonas 2006).
In many ways, administrative boundaries have a far greater impact on the daily behavioural patterns of most individuals than do national and international boundaries. For many, the national boundary is only important inasmuch as it may provide the territorial dimension within which the individual identifies with a national community. Beyond national identity, most of life’s functions take place within the context of local boundaries, both real and perceived.

These authors, in recognising the limitations of their own work, call for further research to be carried out on subnational boundaries and in locations outside of Europe to develop a more meaningful understanding of border processes (Newman & Paasi 1998). It is at this local scale that subnational borders are thought to have the most potential for successful cross-border collaboration (Timothy & Teye 2004). Even in relatively homogenous contexts, subnational political boundaries can be centres for higher levels of conflict and frustration, due to decisions made at the national scale (Buursink 2001). Considering the multiplicity of perspectives and scale-crossing complexity of border processes (Paasi 2010) and tourism destination management (Dredge et al. 2011a; Macbeth, Selwood & Veitch 2012; Veitch 2013; Verbole 1999, 2000, 2009), cross-border processes at the subnational scale effectively involve more scales than is the case for international borders, which divide two nations.

While international border regions have been the main focus of tourism scholars interested in the topic, Timothy (2001: 4) has acknowledged that tourism occurs not only at this scale. As well as international boundaries, he discusses two other scales – subnational or second-order boundaries, ‘such as those between states, provinces, cantons and departments’, and ‘third-order civil divisions’, which include ‘counties, townships, and municipalities’ (in Australia these are called local councils). Timothy (2001: 4) argues that the effects of subnational or second-order borders can be almost as significant as in the case of international boundaries, primarily due to law-making powers in more decentralised nations, such as Australia, while third-order borders ‘have the fewest impacts on human interactions, but […] are nonetheless significant’. This reinforces the importance of considering subnational border regions, which can be as complex and challenging as international border regions, but have been almost completely ignored by researchers.

Some of the limited work completed on subnational border regions indicates that the challenges evident at the international scale may also exist subnationally. A study of county (third-order borders) economic development agencies in several mid-west USA States shows for instance that Economic Development Officers see the counties directly neighbouring their region as their primary competition for investment and business attraction (Goetz & Kayser 1993; Gordon 2007, 2009). Furthermore, the elected officials displayed unwillingness for their county to work collaboratively with other regions as this could have a negative impact on their
constituents, and possibly their re-election hopes (Gordon 2009). Further studies have considered how tourism is managed within counties in the USA. In two cases (North-Eastern Ohio and Northern Indiana), it was found that, while informal links existed among industries within the region, managers felt that promotion of a regionally important attraction just outside of the county, in an attempt to attract tourists into the county, would be a poor use of resources (Naipaul et al. 2009; Wang 2008a). Similar issues were also found in cross-county research in Central Florida (Wang et al. 2013). A study using a comparable approach found that competitive perspectives, uneven financial capacities and differences of tourism development had resulted in limited collaboration among DMOs in eight localities across the region of the South-Central Coast of Vietnam (Nguyen 2014; Nguyen & Pearce 2015).

A study that considered a context closer to Australia focused on the Catlins region on the South Island of New Zealand. The region, while sharing a common name, is divided politically in terms of the management of tourism between South District Council, Otago and Clutha District Council, Sutherland. The researchers found the region had limited cross-border collaboration due to political decisions external to the border region, and due to the councils holding different levels of interest in tourism and differing levels of tourism development. The researchers concluded, though, that ‘the most important factor has been local politics and personalities’ (Lovelock & Boyd 2006: 156). The challenges found in this context, as well as in Vietnam and the USA, related to third-order boundaries. It would be expected that second-order boundaries, or state borders in Australia, would present further issues, particularly in decentralised government configurations (Timothy 2001).

An investigation by Cameron (2014) has been one of the few studies to consider the management of tourism across state scale subnational boundaries, albeit in a unique context. Having interviewed tourism marketing managers in three twin-island states in the Caribbean, he established that constraints existed in terms of the islands in each nation working collaboratively. The author had assumed collaborative approaches would be common, as he was looking at relatively small nations, most of which were highly reliant on tourism. However, he found that the perception was that each island differed in terms of products, target markets, tourism agendas, institutional arrangements, while government bureaucracy limited the potential to work together. Finally, a core-periphery situation existed in terms of some regions having limited products to offer tourists and perceptions that collaboration could be detrimental in terms of image association (e.g. associating an island perceived as being safe for travel with one that is known for its high crime rate). This case alone shows that subnational state boundaries do present many of the challenges that also exist at international borders; further study is needed to produce more insight into the question.
Studies that have considered economic development and tourism management across subnational boundaries have shown CBTM faces many challenges. To better understand these, further empirical analysis is needed. Prior to expounding the approach that will be taken to fill this knowledge gap, the following section details the limited understanding of cross-border management in Australia.

3.5.3 CROSS-BORDER TOURISM IN AUSTRALIA’S FEDERAL SYSTEM

Nations with a federal system of government are an important area of focus regarding subnational border regions. In its most basic form, ‘a federation involves a division (or distribution) of powers between the constituent elements’ (Terry & Giugni 2003: 24). Dredge and Jenkins (2007: 255) further explain:

Federal systems of government are those in which sovereignty is constitutionally divided between at least two levels of government and no single level has power over the other levels. Examples of federal systems include Australia, Canada, the United States, Germany and Switzerland.

Two main principles are inherent in federal systems (Head 2006: 160):

*Principle of federalism* – This principle dictates that government functions should occur at the scale that has the most benefit in terms of the provision of goods and services. An example is the view that international tourism promotion is best completed at the federal scale – although, in Australia, the States conduct their own international promotional activity.

*Principle of subsidiary* – In accordance with this principle, ‘decisions should be taken as close as possible to the citizens by the lowest-level competent authority’, for government to be as responsive as possible to the diversity of needs in particular regions. In the context of tourism management, this suggests that tourism destinations should be managed at the lowest possible scale to respond to the unique needs of the local region. Despite this, in Australia, tourism is managed at the federal, state, regional (in some cases in more than one regional structure) and local scales.

Under federalism, independent “states”, with an existing level of sovereignty, come together in agreement to create a new nation. In Australia, coming to this agreement was a drawn out and complex process (Brown 2004). Inherent in such a process is a constitution that respects and protects subnational state sovereignties, values and ways of doing things. This is distinguished from unitary states, which are normally more homogenous, but undergoing changes in some regions (Hörnström 2013). The result of the federal system in a nation, like Australia, is diverse
systems across the various subnational administrative regions (called *States* and *Territories* in Australia), in accordance with where powers are distributed according to the constitution (Dredge & Jenkins 2007).

Significant diversity can exist in areas where the Federal Parliament does not hold the powers to legislate (Terry & Giugni 2003). This means that border regions spanning subnational borders in Australia can operate in two or more significantly different policy environments. Wanna (2008: 5) has argued that collaboration is also limited in that ‘from the outset of Australia as a nation, there was very little attempt to build collaboration into the design of Australian Federalism and/or to practise it in the early years of Federalism’. He goes on to explain that ‘attempts at collaboration would therefore have to work against the logic of Federalism to succeed, and there would always remain a structural tension in such endeavours’.

This Australian situation has recently become further complicated by several trends:

1. An increasingly dominant and centralist Federal Government (Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet 2014; Twomey & Withers 2007).
2. State Governments that are still strong, but whose power has peaked (Bell 2006: 173; cf. Head 2006).
3. A complete absence of regional government, but a growing mish-mash of inter-government regional arrangements that are largely ad hoc and lack any real cohesion (Bell 2006: 173).
5. Significant duplication and “buck-passing” between scales of government (OECD 2015; Twomey & Withers 2007), despite calls for greater collaboration (Gilchrist & Butcher 2016).
6. Vertical fiscal imbalance, where it is the Federal Government that collects, but the State and Territory Governments that spend, the highest proportion of tax revenue (OECD 2015).

Adding to this complexity are areas that were not included in the Australian Constitution when it was developed in 1901 (Terry & Giugni 2003), such as tourism and environmental management. The difficulty comes in terms of determining responsibility for such policy areas, where it is possible for all scales to avoid an issue, such as issues pertaining to border regions,

---

20 While states are recognised as entities in the Australian constitution, territories are managed and legislated by Acts of Commonwealth Parliament. Different Australian territories have different arrangements (Australian Government 2014a) and undergo changes over time (e.g. Brissenden 2015).
or for all to become involved in the same policy area\textsuperscript{21}, as has been the case of tourism (Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Tolkach, King & Whitelaw 2016). The high level of diversity among the States and Territories of Australia and the complex policy environment of tourism in Australia reinforces the need for research in the field.

Given the limited attention that has been paid to subnational border regions internationally, it is no surprise that limited research has been carried out into the Australian situation. This is despite Australia having numerous scales of borders, with most political entities having taken some level of responsibility for tourism (Dredge & Jenkins 2007). Although some comment has been made regarding the issues of managing tourism within political boundaries within a federated nation (Dredge 2006a; Dredge \textit{et al.} 2011a; Jenkins 1993, 2000), many of the references to political borders in tourism management have been in the form of tangents for studies with a different core focus. This is not unexpected, since political boundaries have not been given anywhere near the attention that they receive in other parts of the world – particularly Europe and North America.

Part of the explanation for this lack of attention is that the nation is land-locked and hence does not have the same kind of border concerns as nations which do share international land boundaries, as is the case on most other continents\textsuperscript{22}. This limited interest is highlighted by the fact that a complete analysis of the formation, development and changes in Australia’s subnational political borders was not completed until relatively recently (Taylor 2006). Another testament to the failure of the academic community to attempt to understand Australia’s border regions is a review of articles published in the premier border studies publication, the \textit{Journal of Borderlands Studies}, in which the authors recognised that, during the publication’s history (dating back to 1986), ‘the journal has made a concerted effort to publish papers concerning borders on every continent (with the exception of Australia)’ (Pisani \textit{et al.} 2009: 1). The conclusion of the review included eight recommendations. Among them, the following are relevant to the aims of this thesis:

- ‘A broadening of the geographic scope of both regions studied and authors submitting their work […]
- Research that is comparative in nature […]
- Research that offers public policy recommendations’ (Pisani \textit{et al.} 2009: 15)

\textsuperscript{21} It is in these instances that duplication and “buck-passing” is likely to occur (OECD 2015; Twomey & Withers 2007; Wanna, Philimore, Fenna & Harwood 2009).

\textsuperscript{22} Even so, Kinnvall (2013) has analysed Australia’s international border processes illustrating that borders are simultaneously dissolving, in terms of new economic links with Asia, and becoming increasingly securitised, for the entry of immigrants.
A study that does refer to cross-border tourism in Australia is that by Jackson and Murphy (2002), who tested Porter’s (1998, 2000a, 2003, 2009) concept of industry clustering in the context of tourism research and management. What is important in Jackson and Murphy’s (2002) paper is less the discussion of the cluster concept but rather the case study discussed. As well as Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, the authors completed a case study analysis of the cross-border cities of Albury and Wodonga (usually simply referred to as Albury-Wodonga) that straddle the Murray River, which divides the States of NSW and Victoria. The authors concluded from an analysis of secondary data and observation that, while it appeared that some cooperation was occurring across the border, it was mainly among private enterprises, while the local government tourism agencies operated independently and, in the opinion of the authors, inefficiently. It was not within the scope of the research to better understand the extent of the cross-border cooperation and no attempt was made to explain the limited integration of the local DMOs.

Two other studies have recognised the impact of Australia’s state borders on tourism collaboration. Both used a quantitative approach and were limited to industry actors in tourism. The first is the work of Lade (2006a, 2006b), who was interested in tourism clusters in the Murray region. Recognising the limited work on tourism clustering and networking, the researcher surveyed between 85-100 businesses in four communities in a region. One of the communities was the cross-border region of Albury-Wodonga, while another was the town of Echuca in Victoria (which is across the river from the much smaller NSW town of Moama). Among the factors considered to be limiting tourism cluster activity were ‘border anomalies’. Lade (2010: 659) explained:

> Results indicate that border anomalies contribute to a fragmented tourism industry structure and, subsequently, a lack of strong industry leadership. Differing government authorities may impede effective cluster development and contribute to the region exhibiting an overall lower competitive advantage.

This conclusion, while lacking depth of analysis due to the research focus and design, supports the expectation that subnational Australian border regions are ‘exhibiting an overall lower competitive advantage’ (659) because of their border position. Therefore, the research argues that the exact nature of border processes occurring in this context is in need of further investigation.

A similar study was the work of Smith (2005, 2011), who considered business manager perceptions of tourism clustering in a cross-border tourism initiative across the NSW-QLD border. The initiative, the Rainforest Way touring route covering a large area of Northern NSW and part of South-East Queensland [SEQ], forms part of the basis of the empirical component of
this thesis and is considered in more depth in Chapter 7. Applying a quantitative methodology, Smith found that, according to the businesses interviewed, ‘border issues’ were among those faced in effective clustering. It was not the intention of the researcher to pursue what this meant and no further explanation was sought as to what issues existed.

The NSW Cross-Border Commissioner, established in 2013 (NSW Trade & Investment 2013), reported that ‘16 key cross-border issue categories’ existed for the State Borders of NSW (NSW Cross-Border Commissioner 2013; NSW Trade & Investment 2012: 8). Two issues relevant to this study were tourism and regional cross-border planning but, apart from singling out feelings of isolation and issues in gaining funding, the report provided minimal detail regarding either specific concerns or the methodological approach used.

Finally, a NSW Government commissioned report recommended that the NSW Government ‘develop approaches to support the particular opportunities of regions near the State’s borders’, recognising the ‘need to conduct cross-border campaigns’ (O’Neill 2008: 7). The report did not detail what kind of campaigns would be suited or how this cross-border activity would occur, nor did it deal with the limitations to such an approach. It did, however, note the importance for CBTM to occur across Australia’s state borders and confirmed that cross-border tourism, while an important opportunity, is not commonplace. This suggests that cross-border tourism faces challenges that have not been investigated.

Despite the high potential for CBTM in Australia and the need for such activity, a review of the literature shows it is not covered by the existing literature, and the way in which CBTM can be improved is not well understood. Other than recognising that cross-border tourism has been attempted and that issues exist, nothing more is currently known. This creates a significant gap in knowledge that this thesis seeks to fill.

3.6 CONCLUSION

The aim of this chapter was to explore the issues associated with CBTM at an international scale and appraise their relevance in managing tourism in Australian subnational border regions. It considered the way in which tourism destinations are defined, managed and managed across borders. Critical analysis of the international tourism management literature led to seven key findings, as follows.

Firstly, while tourism destinations can be defined in multiple ways, there is a tendency for such destinations to be managed through a priori political-administrative borders. Numerous definitions of tourism destinations exist. It has also been acknowledged that tourism destinations, both near and far from borders, are not fixed spaces, but rather are negotiated and ‘dynamic in time and space’ (Zimmerbauer 2011: 223). Nevertheless, tourism destinations
across much of the world continue to be defined and managed using political units at various scales, while tourists rarely see tourism destinations as constrained by the borders used by governments (Pearce & Schänzel 2013, 2015).

Secondly, collaboration in tourism management is considered important, but is more the exception than the rule. The literature has called for greater collaboration in tourism destination management, calling it either important (Dredge et al. 2011a) or a necessity (Leiper et al. 2011) in effective regional tourism destination management. Past studies have found significant barriers to collaboration exist among all actor types in many tourism destinations. While the key aim of collaborative tourism management is to work in a long-term, consensus-driven way, all too often the limitations that exist mean that much of the work is at best cooperative, often characterised by low commitment and short-term projects (Watkins & Bell 2002).

Thirdly, while tourists may not always travel to border regions for their border characteristics, tourism management in border regions is intrinsically more complex than tourism management in other areas. Although many tourists are attracted to border regions due to their border features (Timothy & Gelbman 2015), some tourists are attracted to them for other qualities of the region. Irrespective of why tourists travel to a border region, it has been established that tourism management in border regions is more complex due to the location of the destination in a liminal space intersected by multiple political structures and sets of scales (Timothy 2001; Timothy & Teye 2004).

Fourthly, despite the benefits of managing tourism across borders, the international literature is limited and has found that significant challenges exist. Despite the potential opportunities of CBTM, the number of political boundaries existing globally and the number of calls for further research (Gupta & Dada 2011; Haugland et al. 2011; Naipaul et al. 2009; Sofield 2006; Timothy 2000b), literature on management of tourism in border regions is scarce. Most of the research that exists is focused on international borders, and findings suggest that more examples of ‘regions on paper’ exist than ‘regions in social practice’ (Paasi 2002b: 98). The small number of studies on CBTM found cross-border efforts at international borders have faced significant challenges.

Fifthly, border regions are poorly understood, and subnational border regions even more so. In both the tourism and border literature, it has been acknowledged that subnational borders, while an important area to understand, have been virtually ignored by scholars (Newman & Paasi 1998; Strihan 2008), particularly in Australia (Pisani et al. 2009). This is despite arguments that, even in relatively homogenous contexts, subnational political boundaries can be centres for higher levels of conflict and frustration (Buursink 2001). It was argued subnational border regions are an important area of investigation.
Sixthly, Australian subnational borders are known to have created issues for cross-border tourism management, but they have not been the centre of investigation. A limited number of studies have found that “border issues” and “border anomalies” have impacted the success of tourism management in Australian subnational border regions. Without research into the challenges that exist, it is not possible to improve the success of such cross-border efforts.

Finally, cross-border tourism management in Australian subnational border regions exist in a unique context and situation, which cannot be explained by the international literature. The management of tourism in regions adjacent to Australia’s state borders provides a unique political-administrative context and situation, which is not well explained by the international border literature and has been completely ignored by border researchers.

This thesis makes a significant contribution to knowledge by studying the unique context of Australia and contributes to the literature by being among the first studies to investigate tourism management in a subnational border region. The following chapter details the research approach taken to make this contribution.
This chapter provides a description and justification of the methodological approach that contributes to filling the significant gap in the literature found in Chapter 3. It aims to address Research Objective 2, which is to develop a conceptual framework and research approach to explore tourism management in border regions that acknowledges the complexity of cross-border tourism. It begins by explaining that the research is guided by a social constructionist approach using a qualitative methodology. It then justifies and explains an embedded case strategy to focus on three tourism management episodes in a single border region. This is followed by an explanation of the data collection methods and a justification for using crystallisation. The following sections explain the logic of employing an abductive approach to data analysis and explain how ethical issues were mitigated.

4.1 OVER-ARCHING PARADIGM: SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM

In the wake of discussion by such methodologists as Guba (1990; Guba & Lincoln 1994), there has been a widely held belief that all research must begin with an explicit indication as to where – therefore in which paradigm – researchers situate themselves with respect to the study they are carrying out (Jennings 2001; Neuman 2006; O’Leary 2010). A paradigm is best ‘viewed as a set of basic beliefs (or metaphysics)’ representing ‘a worldview that defines, for its holder, the nature of the “world”’ (Guba & Lincoln 1994: 107). It is argued that, depending on the stance of the researcher, a study should follow the methodology that best aligns with the paradigm accepted (Guba & Lincoln 1994).

Despite the wide acceptance of paradigms as a starting point in research and the commonly required consideration of questions of ontology, epistemology and methodology, even the strongest proponents have accepted that the understanding of paradigms as types of “worldview” is limited. For instance, Guba and Lincoln (1994: 107) accept that ‘the beliefs are basic in the sense that they must be accepted simply on faith’, as ‘there is no way to establish their ultimate truthfulness’. Others have gone as far as to argue against the usefulness of research paradigms (Morgan 2007), while the concept has also been accused as unnecessary and causing a distracting paradigm war (Goles & Hichgeim 2000; Hacking 1999). Others have made the argument that, opposed to the more traditional belief, paradigms result from ‘tensions and conflicts that stretch outside the university to state bureaucracies, pressure groups, big corporations, and community groups’ and are, in fact, shifting human constructions (Nespor 2006: 123). Denzin (2010) has made a similar argument: there have been, and there continue to be, multiple “paradigm wars”, and to accept and be wedded to one approach above all others is
a mistake. In this thesis, the researcher accepts the argument of Guba and Lincoln (1994) that, while no research paradigm is more correct than another, it is important for a researcher to select and justify the specific paradigm they adopt.

The decision as to which research paradigm to accept has been based on a pragmatic approach. The pragmatic approach to philosophy was first postulated in a book titled *Pragmatism: A New Name for Old Ways of Thinking* by William James (1907), strongly drawing on the work of John Stuart Mills (Evans 2008; Stuhr 2010). Further important contributors included Dewey (1929), Mead (1917) and Bentley (1954). Gole and Hirchheim (2000: 261) explain that:

> The overriding issue for pragmatists is whether or not something, be it philosophical assumptions, methodology, or information, is useful – useful in that something in question is instrumental in producing desired or anticipated results […] In a research setting, pragmatists place the research question above such considerations as methodology or the underlying worldview.

As this quote explains, the pragmatist approach places the research question at the centre of the research design, thereby suggesting that the research paradigm one adopts can also be selected on this basis. Sandelowski and Barroso (2007) advance the argument that the phenomenon and situation under study should be the basis for decisions on the underlying research paradigm accepted and the methodology used in a research project. Based on this argument, there is a strong case for a social constructionist approach. Prior to describing this worldview and justifying its relevance in this thesis, it is important to consider the main research paradigms in the social sciences.

According to Neuman (2006), there are two dominant perspectives on research approaches in the social sciences. The first “worldview” is that used in natural sciences23, labelled most commonly as positivism. Such a perspective assumes a global truth and natural laws to be discovered. The approach aims to be objective and holds the assumption that there is minimal human agency, suggesting that ‘free will is largely illusion’ (Neuman 2006: 105). Interpretivism, on the other hand, is based on the work of Weber (1949) and his work on the concept of *verstehen*, which refers to empathetic understanding. The concept is based on the idea ‘that we must learn the personal reasons or motives that shape a person’s internal feelings and guide decisions to act in particular ways’ (Neuman 2006: 89). This broad paradigm is based on the ontology of multiple realities (Bryman 2004); epistemologically, the paradigm is firmly based in researcher subjectivity with an important aim of empathetic understanding (Creswell 1994). Finally, the most commonly used methodology associated with interpretivism

---

23 It has been argued, in fact, that ‘the development of the social sciences has been shadowed by attempts to emulate the natural sciences’ (Jamal & Hollinshead 2001: 66).
is a qualitative approach, as this has the potential to gather a variety of rich realities and to allow empathetic understanding (Neuman 2006). This thesis adopts a social constructionist approach, which is associated with interpretivism.

Interpretivism and social constructionism are often used as interchangeable concepts (e.g. Neuman 2006; Schwandt 1994), but they are not the same (Pernecky 2012). While both hold the same values of multiple realities, researcher subjectivity and human agency, social constructionism goes beyond this and considers the formation of phenomenon and processes in a social context. Hacking (1999: 48) defines social constructionism as:

Various sociological, historical, and philosophical projects that aim at displaying or analysing actual, historically situated, social interactions or causal routes that led to, or were involved in, the coming into being or establishing of some present entity or fact.

Hacking (1999: 6) goes on to explain that something can be socially constructed when it can be said that it ‘need not have existed, or need not be as it is’ or, in other words, it ‘is not determined by the nature of things; it is not inevitable’. While social constructionist arguments have been used in much larger philosophical debates, in this research the view has been taken that only ‘symbolic kinds’, such as political boundaries, are socially constructed and that ‘real kinds’, such as mountains, are not. This is in keeping with the arguments of Edley (2001) and Hacking (1999) and provides a worldview that is useful for the completion of this thesis without the need to enter the debate as to whether ‘natural kinds’ are socially constructed. It agrees with the arguments of Pernecky (2012: 1124) as ‘constructionism is at once realist and relativist’, accepting that humans live both in the ‘physical world and the world of meaning’.

Returning to the question of the alignment of this thesis. Several points can be made to support the decision to use a social constructionist approach. Firstly, the over-arching question directing the research is directly linked to the ideas of social constructionism. The fact that the research explores and uncovers the views of tourism actors implies an underlying worldview, which accepts multiple realities and values individual perspectives in understanding the phenomenon of interest. Secondly, a social constructionist approach aligns well with the phenomenon being explored in that numerous aspects involved in the research have been argued as social constructs. This includes tourism (Urry 1990, 1992, 2001) and tourism places (Young 1990, 1992, 2001) and tourism places (Young 1999), political borders and regions (Leimgruber 1991; Nilsson et al. 2010; Paasi 1996, 2010; Perkins & Rumford 2013; Stöber 2011), and institutions and networks (Phillips, Lawrence & Hardy 2000).

Furthermore, an underlying assumption of social constructionism allows the researcher to deal with the ‘messiness’ of social science (Law 2004, 2007). Specifically, it has been said that in
tourism, and social settings generally, ‘realities are fluid, dynamic, vague, socially constructed and multiply constituted’, meaning that complexity must be recognised for understanding to occur (Coles, Hall & Duval 2006: 295), particularly when dealing with wicked problems (Coles et al. 2006; Dredge, Hales & Jamal 2013), such as transboundary phenomena. Finally, social constructionism calls for the researcher to reject “objective” accounts of tourism that fail to acknowledge their one-sided, partial focus’ and to instead acknowledge, that to be a researcher in tourism is to be human and ‘to be human is to operate in a world of meaning, and researchers cannot distance themselves nor can they get access to superior vistas’ (Pernecky 2010: 7). As such, by accepting a social constructionist approach, this thesis will be more ‘critical, situated and *emic*’ than other approaches and will allow for a more complete account to be taken into ‘the connectedness of things, places, and people’ (Pernecky 2010: 2) in the border region.

From a purely pragmatic perspective, the use of a qualitative methodology fits in well with other considerations. Firstly, Chapters 2 and 3 recounted a significant number of calls for further qualitative research in the collaboration (e.g. Miller, Besser & Weber 2010; Quack 2006; Strihan 2008) and border studies (e.g. Kolossov 2005; Newman 2000; Newman & Paasi 1998; Paasi 1996) literature. Secondly, as the phenomenon under investigation is wicked, complex and located in a complicated environment, a qualitative approach is particularly useful (Dredge et al. 2013; Sandelowski & Barroso 2007). Finally, as can be seen in Figure 4.1, research that involves the investigation of networks and explicit collaborative relationships – as is the case in this thesis – is best investigated using a qualitative approach, which allows for the consideration of experiences, perspectives and processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Concept</th>
<th>Conceptual/Definitional Depth</th>
<th>Empirical Methodology</th>
<th>Ease of Measurement</th>
<th>Empirical Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-location</td>
<td>Shallow</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Easy to measure</td>
<td>Indirect/secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-location and technological proximity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input-output table and complementarities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-location and superior performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallian externalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal knowledge spillovers</td>
<td>Deep</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Hard to measure</td>
<td>Direct/primary sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Martin and Sunley (2003), adapted from Swann (2002)
4.2 Research Strategy: Case Study

To investigate the issue of tourism management in border regions, an embedded case study strategy was employed. Prior to justifying the decision to select specific tourism management episodes in three local government areas (LGAs) at the coastal (eastern) end of the NSW-QLD border as the basis, it is important to explain why an embedded case study strategy is justified in pursuit of the research aim and objectives (see Section 1.2). This will involve an explanation of the case study strategy, as well as a discussion of the benefits and criticisms of the research strategy.

Case study research is a form of empirical investigation that aims to detail and develop a depth of knowledge about a case or several cases (Beeton 2005; Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007; Stake 1994; Woodside & Wilson 2003). Coming from a pragmatic perspective, research that rests on a case study strategy usually investigates a contemporary phenomenon that cannot be clearly distinguished from the context (Denzin & Lincoln 1994b) and, due to the complexity of the phenomenon, ‘relies on multiple sources of evidence’ (Yin 2009: 18). In contrast with more rigid experimental and survey strategies, which rely on the investigation of a limited number of variables and the testing of hypotheses (Bryman 2004), case study research uses empirical evidence to explore and refine theoretical knowledge to explore gaps and questions regarding a complex phenomenon (Beeton 2005; Eisenhardt 1989, 1991; Merriam 1998).

Further justification of the applicability of a case study strategy in this thesis is that collaboration is necessarily complex (Gummesson 2007: 226). Similar justification comes with the position that the principle objective of research employing a case study strategy should be the ‘deep understanding of actors, interactions, sentiments, and behaviours for a specific process through time’ (Woodside & Wilson 2003: 497). Both points provide substantial justification for using the case study strategy in this thesis, but also more broadly in research investigating network activity. Nevertheless, the case study strategy has received significant criticism from researchers (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner 1984; Bonoma 1985), often devaluing the approach as lacking rigour and having only limited use (Beeton 2005; Platt 1992). The criticisms have been on three main grounds and have been given prominence in the writings of one of the most prolific case study methodologists (see Yin 1981, 1989, 1994, 2003, 2009).

The first issue is the perceived lack of rigour associated with the case study strategy. Yin (2009: 14) deems this argument to be unfounded as just because an ‘investigator has been sloppy, has not followed systemic procedures, or has allowed equivocal evidence or biased views to influence the direction of the findings and conclusions’ does not mean that all case study research lacks rigour. Employing a variety of data collection methods, using a myriad of empirical evidence, and producing a complex and reflective understanding of the world can
appear, to some, as “unscientific” (Bryman & Bell 2007; Denzin & Lincoln 1994a). However, Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) argue that such a perspective is myopic and that this complexity and reflection in understanding the world is the case study strategy’s main strength. They posit that the case study approach is the most appropriate for theory building, particularly when limited theory exists around a phenomenon – as is the case in this thesis.

Czarniawska (1997, 2004) contends that the issues faced by researchers completing case study research are no different to the issues faced by researchers completing studies using other strategies. According to Yin (1994), the most important way of overcoming the issue of questionable rigour is to ensure that a structured research methodology has been developed and these procedures have been clearly reported, not necessarily for repeatability but for auditing. Authors such as Yin (2009) and Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) posit that this discipline is expected to minimise researcher subjectivity entering the research process. On the other hand, subjectivity should be embraced as researcher embeddedness increases the depth of insight, which cannot be gained through other means (Edelheim 2009; Ellingson 1998, 2009; Richardson & St. Peirre 2005; Stake 2008). Mintzberg (2005) claims research considered “scientific” or “rigorous” is often better termed ‘bureaucratic research, because it seeks to factor out the human dimension – imagination, insight, discovery’, which are essential in developing ‘interesting theory’. In keeping with this argument and an underlying worldview of social constructionism, the researcher’s entanglements that enrich understanding and, as such, discipline in practice and reporting should aim to ensure that all angles are recognised and no voices are forgotten or are stronger than others (Ellingson 1998, 2009; Tracy 2010). This, more appropriate, approach to ensuring rigour in the research process in this thesis is dealt with in more detail in Section 4.4.1, which explains the concept of crystallisation in qualitative research.

A second criticism of the case study strategy is that it does not provide results that are scientifically generalisable. At the basis of this argument is the idea that, as the sample population used in case study research is not statistically representative, the findings have limited use (Yin 2003). Lipset, Trow and Coleman (1956: 419-20) are considered the first notable social scientists to have dealt with this issue in their research. The authors contended that the aim of the research was not to provide an analysis that was ‘particularising’, but rather ‘generalising’.

In a similar vein, Yin (2009) explains that experiments, while widely accepted as scientific, are not statistically generalisable in this sense either. It is argued, however, that case study research, like experimental research, relies on replication logic, which entails a phenomenon, such as tourism management in border regions, being studied in several contexts. The goal of case study research, and this thesis, is to ‘expand and generalize theories’ through a process of ‘analytical
generalization’ (Yin 2009: 14), building on previous case studies and the existing literature (Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007; Stake 2008). Flyvbjerg (2006: 222) explains this concept in the following way:

Common to all experts […] is that they operate on the basis of intimate knowledge of several thousand concrete cases in their areas of expertise. Context dependent knowledge and experience are at the very heart of the expert activity. Such knowledge and expertise also lie at the centre of case study as a research and teaching method.

Following this logic, recent studies of tourism episodes (Dredge et al. 2011a; Pavlovich 2003; Verbole 2000) provide evidence that this approach is common in tourism management research, while also being an important approach to a highly contextualised phenomenon such as tourism management in border regions.

The third main criticism against the case study approach is that case studies take a long time to complete (Yin 1994) and that the report resulting from research using a case study strategy can be ‘extremely long’ because of ‘the richness of data and complexity of analysis’ (Beeton 2005: 40). This criticism is less to the point, as it rests on a confusion between case study research and data collection methods such as those used in ethnography and certain types of participant observation, which can take a long time to complete and often produce a lot of data (Yin 2009). While case study research does involve multiple sources of evidence and does have the potential to become unwieldy during reporting, it has been posited that strict boundaries be placed around the research to ensure that this does not become an issue (Merriam 1998). In other words, as with any other research, data collection must be researcher-led as opposed to data-led through the establishment of specific research objectives and a well-designed data collection process (Huberman & Miles 2002; Veal 2006). As is explained in further depth throughout this chapter, boundaries have been set regarding the research, procedures were set and followed, and specific research objectives were devised.

Overall, a case study strategy is appropriate for this thesis because (1) it generates theory (as opposed to tests theory) due to a lack of previous literature from which to develop hypotheses; (2) it provides a deep understanding of actors, interactions and behaviours; and (3) it provides a means to investigate a contemporary phenomenon that cannot be separated from its context.
4.2.1 CASE STUDY DESIGN: SINGLE CASE WITH EMBEDDED SUB-CASES

An important aspect of ensuring that research employing a case study strategy is recognised as rigorous is to justify and report all aspects of the case study design (Eisenhardt 1991; Perry 1998; Yin 1981, 1994). This section explains that a single case embedded design was used and argues why this approach was appropriate.

Yin (2009) concedes that there are four main types of case study design, which can be differentiated depending on the number of cases under study and the number of units of analysis within each case. In this thesis, a single case with three sub-cases was used, and is best represented by Yin’s (2009: 46) embedded case study configuration (see Figure 4.2). The justification for using a single case is first discussed, followed by an explanation of the embedded design.

Figure 4.2 Embedded Case Study Design

Source: Adapted from Yin (2009: 46)

4.2.1.1 SINGLE CASE

The idea of researching a single case has been at the heart of significant debate among social scientists for some of the reasons already discussed around issues such as rigour and representativeness (Flyvbjerg 2006). While this line of thinking has certainly not been totally removed, it is now much more accepted that a carefully chosen single case study can contribute to theory building and testing (Beeton 2005; Bitektine 2008; Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007; Flyvbjerg 2006; Stake 2008; Woodside & Wilson 2003; Yin 2009). Importantly, the case study needs to be carefully chosen to ensure that it makes a significant contribution to theory.
Yin (2009: 47) posits five rationales for using a single case study approach to research. The current research is most prominently aligned with the first rationale, which is the concept of the ‘critical case’. This is a case that meets ‘all of the conditions for testing the theory’ and that ‘can confirm, challenge or extend the theory’. As has been argued in Chapter 3, this research is in response to a significant gap in the literature, which means that this thesis will contribute to theory building. A similar perspective is one that considers the ‘instrumental case’, which is used ‘mainly to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization’ (Stake 2000: 437). Again, this relates well to this thesis topic, in that the chosen case (discussed in further detail in Section 4.3) provides insight into an area of theory that requires further research.

Beeton (2005: 42) accepts that tourism research requires exemplary cases and that there are five general characteristics of such cases. She posits that an exemplary case ‘must be significant, complete, consider alternative perspectives, display sufficient evidence and be composed in an engaging manner’. This research has satisfied these criteria in the following ways.

- **Significance** – the research aim developed for this thesis is based on significant knowledge gaps in the existing literature (see Chapters 2 and 3). Furthermore, the discovery and theory building resulting from the research is expected to be of international significance.

- **Completeness** – as detailed in Chapter 1 and in the following sections of this chapter, defining the specific geographical boundaries of the study means that research boundaries have been erected around the study from a theoretical perspective, through specific research objectives, as well as from a methodological perspective.

- **Consideration of alternative perspectives** – this is at the heart of the research. Through a combination of researcher-driven theoretical and snowball sampling, the research attempted to maximise the range of perspectives obtained. This was completed through consideration of a range of organisations from the three tourism episodes and through obtaining insights from a variety of lateral actor organisational types using a ‘crystallisation’ approach (discussed in further detail in Section 4.4.1).

- **Display of sufficient evidence** – in accordance with Yin’s (2009) suggestions, this research was designed in such a way as to maximise the number of sources of evidence, including secondary sources, interviews and participant observation. This had the benefit of allowing crystallisation, but was also important in gathering complete information, which could not have been gathered from any single source (this is considered further in Section 4.4.1).

- **Engaging presentation** – it is thought that any case study must be reported in such a way as to engage the intended audience (Yin 1994). To ensure that this research was written in an engaging manner, the researcher analysed the reporting methods of similar
case study research (e.g. Dredge 2006a; Pavlovich 2003; Verbole 2000; Wang & Krakover 2008) and developed a reporting format to engage the audience by placing the research within context and including rich quotes.

4.2.1.2 **EMBEDDED UNIT OF ANALYSIS**

Within this thesis, embedded cases (or sub-cases) were considered important for exploring the topic and developing a greater understanding of the complexities of the issue under study. The approach accepted the multi-scale and complex nature of tourism episodes (Dredge & Jenkins 2011; Verbole 2000, 2003). Yin (2009: 50) makes the distinction between holistic and embedded case studies, with embedded case studies involving a single case study where ‘attention is also given to a subunit or subunits’. Yin (1994) posits that including subunits has the potential to provide a more complex understanding of a phenomenon, through more extensive analysis. Taking a pragmatic approach, Stake (2000) accepts that much research that employs a case study strategy will involve units of analysis at lower levels than the main case study. Following the example of previous studies interested in tourism management (Dredge 2001; Ninan 2005), this thesis employs a multiple level case study approach.

As can be seen in Figure 4.3, the highest level of empirical consideration is the case study border region, which includes three LGAs adjacent to the NSW-QLD State border (labelled as the *border region* in Figure 4.3). The framework was developed based on Hall and Jenkins’ (1995) conceptual framework, which has been used to study a range of tourism issues (e.g. Dredge 2001; Lovelock & Boyd 2006). Within the framework, the *macro-level* represents the key perspectives and paradigms, such as globalisation and neo-liberalism, that influence tourism globally. The *meso-level* includes the organisational structures, strategies and resourcing allowances that influence organisational policies on tourism, collaboration and cross-border efforts. The *border region* represents the meta-physical space where actors interested in tourism issues interact and influence one another (Lovelock & Boyd 2006). The *actors* exist at various scales and can be more or less involved in certain episodes. The *time* and *space axes* are metaphysical representations that acknowledge that CBTMEs change over time, whether it is in terms of the actors involved, the geographical boundaries of an episode or the influences at the macro- and meso-levels (Paasi 2010). The *flows of capital, goods, people and information* represent movement of resources into and out of the border, in an increasingly globalised world (Chen 2005; Dredge & Jamal 2013).
Within the case study border region, there are three cross-border tourism episodes that provide in-depth focus (labelled as episodes within Figure 4.3). The process of analysis using this framework would be best described as bottom-up, where interviews with individual lateral actors were used, with other sources of evidence used to gain insight and provide for the analysis of the episodes. Finally, analysis of these episodes provided a means of gaining insight into the opportunities and challenges characteristic of tourism management in the broader case study region.

Yin (2009) argues that the main issue when using an embedded approach is that the researcher analyses not only the subunits, but also considers the main case. If this is not upheld, the case study design is no longer that of a single case embedded study and issues of rigour will arise. Stake (2008) acknowledges that the most important consideration when using numerous cases within the main case study is the selection of cases, which is taken up in the next section.
4.3 Case Study and Selection of Units of Analysis

The research first involved the selection of the border region and then the units of analysis within the regions. This section discusses the case study border region, with the following sections detailing the CBTMEs and actors.

4.3.1 Case Study: Australian East Coast Border Region

The selection of the case study region was based on the requirements of a critical (Yin 2009), instrumental (Stake 2000) or exemplary (Beeton 2005) case, the main parameter being appropriateness of the case study region for building and extending theory in alignment with the research objectives. To this end, the advice of Donahue (2004) was taken to avoid a case study that was tempting due to its ease of study and to instead focus on a case that provides the best insight into the phenomenon. It also was important to ‘decentre the border’ in ‘an effort to problematise the border not as a taken-for-granted entity, but precisely as a site of investigation’ (Parker & Vaughan-Williams 2012: 728). The case study region was made up of three LGAs adjacent to the NSW-QLD border. Two QLD LGAs were selected (Gold Coast City and Scenic Rim Region) and one was selected from NSW (Tweed Shire). As can be seen in Figure 4.4, these LGAs are adjacent to each other and form a contiguous area crossing the QLD/NSW border. Figure 4.5 situates the case study border region with regards to the eastern and central States of Australia, as well as the relevant State capitals (Brisbane, QLD and Sydney, NSW) and the Federal capital (the Australian Capital Territory).

This region was selected as it had several important characteristics. The first of these was that the actors in each of the LGAs were highly involved with the CBTMEs. Furthermore, the eastern end of the NSW-QLD border is one of the most tourism-oriented and tourism-reliant border regions in Australia (Tourism Research Australia [TRA] 2011b), while also being the most highly populated border region in Australia, with the last population count standing at 591,473 (followed by Canberra, ACT-Queanbeyan, NSW (410,419) and Albury, NSW-Wodonga, Victoria (106,052); Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS] 2012a). Collectively, the area also has had one of the highest population growth rates in Australia over the past decade (ABS 2012b, 2012c).
In addition, the region has a shared topographical feature known as the Green Cauldron, a caldera of extinct volcanoes, and numerous world heritage rainforests on both sides of the border, which form part of the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia (DSEWPC 2008; Edwards 2004), an area that holds significant tourism potential. Furthermore, as detailed in Chapters 5 and 6, actors in the regions adjacent to the state border have recognised the complex social, economic and environmental connections existing within the cross-border region (QLD Department of Infrastructure and Planning 2009; QLD Government/NSW Government 2011; SGS Economics and Planning 2005).

The researcher selected this region as it was known that there were tourism initiatives in the region that were intended to involve cross-border collaboration. This knowledge was gained through initial contact with some actors in the region and an analysis of secondary data. A previous quantitative study in the region recognised the important influence of the border in a tourism initiative, but border processes were not the focus of the investigation (Smith 2005, 2011). This provided a basis for analysis of CBTMEs and meant actors existed in the region that could provide insights from their own experience. Further information on the region, including the context of the case, is discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

---

24 A caldera is defined as a number of usually elliptically shaped ‘subcircular depressions, in volcanic areas’, which can range in size from a matter of meters to tens of kilometres. They are thought to be ‘the surface expression of the emptying of the magma chamber during effusive or explosive eruptions. Because of an underpressure within the magma chamber at some point before the collapse, the roof of the reservoir yields, forming a depression at surface’ (Acocella 2007: 125).
An important issue is that the LGAs in the case study border region, while involved in cross-border interactions with one another, also had linkages with other LGAs outside of the border region. The purpose of the delineation of the study area selected does not suggest that these other linkages and interactions do not exist, but rather it was a pragmatic decision based on what was feasibly possible within the time and resource constraints to which the study was subject. While specific focus was given to the three LGAs indicated previously, a qualitative research approach provided the researcher with the flexibility to consider a broader region, if and when opportunities to do so were to arise. An example of this was the consideration given to the interactions of the numerous LGAs surrounding the Tweed Shire. While the research did not focus specifically on these surrounding LGAs, discussion with research participants led to consideration of relations with such regions without the added resource requirements of having direct contact with representatives within each LGA. As two of the three tourism episodes investigated were not contained within just the case study region and some tourism actors with responsibility for the border region were not based in the three LGAs of interest, this was particularly important.

Finally, case study research is highly influenced by the decisions made by the researcher (Yin 2009). The research boundaries are based primarily on the purpose of theory testing and building but if a different researcher were to conduct the same study, a different region could be selected. This variation is not seen as a cause for concern, but rather as an advantage of case study research in that the researcher can gain significant depth and rich understanding of the
situation (Ellingson 1998, 2009). In a similar vein, the fact that the researcher was not a borderlander, living away from the border in the State of NSW and the Australian Capital Territory during the study, meant that the area of investigation was treated differently to what would be expected by someone residing within the case study border region. Borderlanders may hold a perspective influenced by their own experiences of living and working in a border region (House 1980; Newman & Paasi 1998; Paasi 1996). Offering an outsider’s view of a research problem, on the other hand, can provide a significant benefit (Edelheim 2009; Warren & Karner 2005). In fact, it has been said that ‘often an outsider can detect the taken-for-grantedness of daily practices within a setting’ (Ellingson 2009: 78). At a very basic level, this could be seen in the researcher noticing the common feature of two clocks on the walls of most office spaces in the border region (because of the hour time difference across the border during summer, as only NSW recognises daylight savings time), which was a normal part of the lives of many of the participants, but unfamiliar to the researcher.

4.3.2 SUB-CASES: TOURISM MANAGEMENT EPISODES

In messy social situations involving numerous actors and organisations across a diverse region, it is difficult to establish units of analysis. It was decided that tourism management episodes would be analysed within the case study context. In ‘dynamic, socially constructed landscapes’, such as the landscape under study in this thesis, an episodic approach has been argued as particularly relevant (Dredge et al. 2011c: 51). Episodes as sub-cases have been used in numerous situations, including organisational studies (Hendry & Seidl 2003; Luhmann 1990), spatial planning research (Healey 1997, 2003, 2004; Wang 2010) and tourism research (Bhat & Milne 2011; Higgins-Desbiolles 2011; Pearce 2011; Shone 2011). The concept of tourism management episodes provides the fluidity needed to analyse what is a complex phenomenon. The study of episodes, as opposed to more static concepts such as networks and clusters, also allows for the dynamic nature of tourism management in border regions to be investigated within the broader multi-scale context within which flows are constantly taking place (Parker & Vaughan-Williams 2012; Parker, Vaughan-Williams, Bialasiewicz, Bulmer, Carver, Durie, Heathershaw, van Houtum, Kinnvall, Kramsch, Nminca, Murray, Panjek, Rumford, Schaap, Sidawa & Williams 2009), providing a richer, fuller picture of the processes occurring during the episode (Healey 2003).

In line with Alcantara, Broschek and Nelles (2016: 38), the episodes were ‘inductively generated’, ‘analytically anchored at the meso-level (e.g. actors embedded within institutionalized settings)’. In this thesis, the focus was on three CBTMEs, which were selected primarily based on the extent to which they were expected to assist in investigating and achieving the research aim. This approach would best align with the sampling procedure.
labelled theoretical sampling (Burgess 1984; Corbin & Strauss 2008). Although not strictly a sampling technique, in the usual sense of the concept (Sarantakos 2005), this process was first suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967: 45) as a ‘process of data collection for generating theory’. Applying a theoretical sampling approach, the researcher began searching secondary data with limited preconceptions of the tourism episodes of most relevance to the research; however, following a process of abduction (Neuman 2006; Reichertz 2004), the selected episodes emerged and became an important focus.

Although limited CBTMEs were recognised in the region, careful consideration was given as to which episodes would provide the most useful insight and understanding regarding the research objectives of interest within the broader case study. This, again, follows the rules of theoretical sampling in that units of analysis should be selected based on how well they can lead to richer insight and understanding through comparison (Strauss & Corbin 1998). It was expected that, by analysing three tourism episodes with different attributes, synthesis and evaluation would provide deeper understanding.

4.3.2.1 TOURISM ACTORS

One of the most important issues when undertaking field work in the social sciences is the selection of research participants (McGehee 2012; Sarantakos 2005). The study of tourism management episodes featuring political boundaries is a complex task, and strategies and models advocated in the research literature are difficult to apply directly. Following an extensive literature review of research on collaboration and research design, it was decided that a theoretical sampling method was most appropriate when paired with snowball and stratified sampling. It was recognised that, while certain methods used in previous studies to select participants (e.g. Beaumont & Dredge 2010; Hervas-Oliver & Albers-Garrigos 2009; Miller et al. 2010; Naipaul et al. 2009; Reid, Smith & Carroll 2008) provided some direction as to useful methods, a pragmatic approach, drawing from the broader research literature, was to be employed, as these studies had limited direct interest in borders.

First introduced by Glaser and Strauss (1967: 45), the concept of theoretical sampling, as it has come to be known, was advocated as a ‘process of data collection for generating theory’. Using this logic, participants in this research were selected based on the extent to which their insights were considered able to contribute to generating theory. In accordance with this technique of data collection (Burgess 1984; Holstein & Gubrium 1995; Strauss & Corbin 1998), an initial list of actors was drawn from a review of relevant literature, existing documentation (e.g. media articles, websites and reports) and by meeting people at workshops and meetings. In the early interviews, each participant suggested other persons to contact to discuss the relevant tourism episodes, either by implicit reference to the person during the interview or by explicitly
asking if the researcher had spoken to a certain person. While this method appears to have similarities with snowball sampling, which involves the researcher requesting suggestions for further interviewees (Bryman 2004), following the ideals of theoretical sampling, these suggestions were considered from the perspective of theory development prior to the researcher requesting an interview with every person suggested. An important advantage of gaining these suggestions for further participants was that the interviewees could often suggest contacts that were no longer part of the project of focus or even the tourism industry in the region, but had the potential to provide substantial insight.

A snowball sampling method alone would not have allowed much of this to happen. Therefore, in addition, the integration of a stratified sampling method was considered necessary, since the research involved gaining insight around political borders. Although used most prominently in quantitative research, the benefit of this method is that the division of a population into strata allows the researcher to ensure that insights are gained from all groups (Sarantakos 2005). Although this method was not employed strictly, especially with reference to the exact number of actors from each region, as would be the case in quantitative research (Veal 2006), it was in the forefront of the researcher’s mind for actors to be drawn from both sides of the border.

Strauss and Corbin (1998: 212) state that data collection, and thus sampling, discontinues when theoretical saturation has been achieved, therefore when data collection no longer generates new data and categories are ‘well developed in their properties and dimensions’, while relationships among the categories are ‘established and validated’. Applying this idea to the current research was slightly problematical in that, as would be expected, the heterogeneous ideas, perspectives and values of the various actors were unlikely to produce theoretical saturation in the terms suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998). To counteract this issue, the researcher attempted to gain the highest level of diversity among the actors within a sample size that was feasible for a project of this size. Such an approach accepts the premise ‘that events, processes, and actors can be interpreted differently from different perspectives’ (Rumford 2012: 893).

Scholars such as Strauss (1995) have argued that lack of direction is among the issues that qualitative researchers have faced in establishing the usefulness of qualitative research. Only limited direction with respect to the most appropriate sample size is provided to researchers completing qualitative case study research. Case study theorists have provided minimums and maximums. Minimums have been set at four (Eisenhardt 1989) to six (Hedges 1985), with Eisenhardt (1989) arguing that employing less than this does not result in theory with much complexity. Miles and Huberman (1994: 30) posit that research employing more than 15 interviews can become ‘unwieldy’, while Perry (1998) has suggested that 35 to 50 interviews is the maximum that he would set for the largest of projects. This shows that, while a
common minimum has been set, there is significant disparity as to the maximum number of interviews suggested by the literature.

After due consideration of the number of people involved in the CBTMEs in the case study region, the sample sizes in previous similar studies and the resource and time constraints of the project, it was decided that a maximum of 25 interviews was appropriate to gain sufficient insight to build complex theory (Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007) while remaining within the resource constraints of the research project (Yin 2009). In total, 28 actors were contacted; 24 agreed to participate. 13 participants were female and 11 were male. In some cases, the first person contacted was the person interviewed within an organisation, but in some cases, this person indicated that someone else in the organisation would be more appropriate to speak to. No outright rejections were encountered, but it was clear from the difficulty that the researcher had in contacting some potential interviewees that they may have been unwilling to participate, perhaps due to the politically sensitive nature of the research topic or to the fact that the actor did not see the issue under study as a high priority given their time and work commitments. Because of this, it was not possible to achieve a sample that included representatives from all types of lateral actors in each LGA. To complicate matters further, some LGAs did not have comparative organisations, making it impossible from the outset to achieve such a sample. As can be seen in Table 4.1, a variety of lateral actors participated in the research; it was considered that this sample provided a good basis for crystallisation (see Section 4.4.1) and theory building.

Table 4.1 List of Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Interviewee Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Actor Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Tweed Chamber of Commerce Inc.</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Southern Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principle Project Officer – Tourism</td>
<td>Economic Development Department, Gold Coast City Council</td>
<td>Economic Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer [CEO]</td>
<td>Destination Tweed (formerly Tweed Tourism)</td>
<td>Economic Development/Tourism Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Connecting Southern Gold Coast [CSGC]</td>
<td>Economic Development Agency/DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tourism Development Officer</td>
<td>Tourism Department, Scenic Rim Shire Council</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Regional Development Australia [RDA], Northern Rivers</td>
<td>Regional Development Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tourism Officer; Chairperson</td>
<td>Tourism Department, Richmond Council; Australian Regional Tourism Network [ARTN]</td>
<td>Destination Management Organisation, Tourism Manager Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Division 14 Councillor</td>
<td>Gold Coast City Council</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Detailing the methods used and procedures followed in collecting data is considered of the utmost importance in guaranteeing rigour, particularly in qualitative research (Yin 2009). This section provides a description and justification, based on the research literature, of how data was collected to inform the research underpinning this thesis. It discusses a method that involved three categories of data sources: semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and secondary data. While the reasoning behind using various forms of data has already been considered in the previous section, it is important, prior to considering each method of data collection, to expand on the decision to use a process of crystallisation.
4.4.1 CRYSTALLISATION

For some time, one of the most cited texts regarding rigour in qualitative research and particularly case study research was Denzin’s (1978) book *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. This book emphasised triangulation, which essentially follows a process of cross-examining, as an important aspect of any sociological research, providing the necessary rigour for the research findings to make a scientific contribution.

Many case study researchers (e.g. Eisenhardt 1989, 1991; Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007; Stake 2008; Yin 2003, 2009) consider triangulation to be one of the most important features of any research project employing a case study approach. Similarly, many qualitative researchers encourage employing triangulation when completing a research project (e.g. Bryman 2008; Maxwell 2005, 2008; Opperman 2000; Patton 1980, 2002). Yin (2009: 116) makes the point that research employing a multiple method approach is ‘more convincing and accurate’ as it allows for the corroboration of various findings. Similarly, it has been said that ‘the triangulation made possible by multiple data collection methods provides stronger substantiation of constructs and hypotheses’ (Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007: 538).

More recently, the concept of triangulation has come into question. Denzin (2010: 423) has recently moved from being the authority on triangulation to questioning its usefulness. He argues that ‘[o]ver the past four decades, each decade has taken up triangulation and refined it to meet perceived needs’. He then goes on to explain that ‘the very term is unsettling, and unruly. It disrupts and threatens the belief that reality in its complexities can never be fully captured’. Others have made similar points about the incompatibility of triangulation and qualitative research, which assumes multiple realities – positing that the concept of crystallisation is more appropriate (Dredge & Hales 2012a; Richardson 2000; Saukko 2003; Taylor & Trujillo 2009).

Minimal examples of crystallisation in research were said to exist prior to the work of Richardson (1994, 2000; Richardson & St. Peirre 2005). Richardson (2000) herself has suggested that certain works published before hers do indeed appear to reflect the principles of the concept prior to her writing on the topic. In an article titled *Writing as a Method of Inquiry*, Richardson (2000) broadly introduced crystallisation as a qualitative approach to uncovering the multiple realities at the heart of qualitative research. More recently, Ellingson (2009: 4) maintains that, while Richardson forged new ground in her writings on crystallisation, ‘she did not explain crystallisation as a methodological framework or process’. Recognising this issue, Ellingson (2009), drawing on her research in the health sector (Ellingson 1998), introduced a framework for qualitative researchers, which has come to be recognised as a useful source in the
literature (Cugno & Thomas 2009; Denzin 2010). In her book, *Engaging Crystallization in Qualitative Research: An Introduction*, Ellingson (2009: 4) explains:

> Crystallization combines multiple forms of analysis and multiple genres of representation into a coherent text or series of texts, building a rich and openly partial account of a phenomenon that problematizes its own construction, highlights researchers’ vulnerabilities and positionality, makes claims about socially constructed meanings, and reveals the indeterminacy of knowledge claims even as it makes them.

Ellingson (2009) emphasises that, while a variety of different types of qualitative projects can employ crystallisation, the methodological framework is most applicable to projects with certain characteristics, some of which are shared by this project. Using some of Ellingson’s (2009: 10) words, the latter:

- ‘Offer[s] deep, thickly described, complexly rendered interpretations of the meanings about a phenomenon or group’.
- ‘Represent[s] ways of producing knowledge across multiple points of the qualitative continuum’ including reflecting ‘several ways of knowing’.
- ‘Include[s] a significant degree of reflexive consideration’ by the researcher.
- Rejects the positivist assumption of ‘objectivity and a singular, discoverable Truth’ in favour of embracing ‘knowledge as situated, partial, constructed, multiple, embodied, and enmeshed in power relations’.

Furthermore, the concept of crystallisation has been said to be particularly fitting within a social construction paradigm (Gergen 1994; Holstein & Gubrium 2005). In a research project studying a wicked problem involving a complex set of social interactions and perspectives, applying crystallisation will assist in painting a fuller picture of the phenomenon and provide the most in-depth understanding of the various ways in which reality is constructed (as has been argued by Cochrane 2013). For the present purposes, as can be seen in Table 4.2, a variety of sources, incorporating various lenses, were used to develop a full understanding of the issue at hand.

It was recognised that, while a crystallisation approach provided for the consideration of various perspectives, including different data sources and approaches to uncovering these various viewpoints also provided a fuller understanding to the researcher of points that participants were willing to make in different situations. As an example, the points that were made by some participants were very different in public meetings, while speaking to the media and when being interviewed by the researcher on a one-on-one basis. This aspect of the methodological approach allowed greater understanding of the political dynamics of the networks and the relations of the actors.
4.4.2 Participant Interviews

Despite the acknowledgement that ‘case studies can accommodate a rich variety of data sources’, Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007: 28) state interviews ‘often become the primary data source’ as they ‘are a highly efficient way to gather rich, empirical data, especially when the phenomenon of interest is episodic and infrequent’. In accordance with these authors, interviews were the most appropriate means for investigating the research topic, which was not only episodic and infrequent, but also included a historical aspect that was, in many cases, not available except by speaking to the lateral actors who have been involved in or influenced activity in each tourism management episode. Interviews are an important aspect of understanding the complex relationships between the various contextual factors and the tourism actors of interest, as well as between tourism actors (Lovelock & Boyd 2006; Wilkinson & March 2008). In the border studies literature, it has also been argued that interviews are suitable as they ‘provide a deeper understanding of interviewees’ beliefs and values and a better grasp of how individuals experience and make sense of their own lives’. In addition, they ‘provide the interviewer with the opportunity to clarify contested issues, where necessary’ (Paül & Trillo-Santamaria 2014: 6). Furthermore, from a pragmatic perspective, this method was seen as particularly appropriate as it was an efficient way of gaining rich data (Yin 2003). Given the advantages of interviewing, it is no surprise that it is the most common data collection method used in the social sciences (Fontana & Frey 1994; Holstein & Gubrium 2003).

Table 4.2 Research Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Primary Data | In-depth interviews with past and present tourism lateral actors  
Participate observation (e.g. attendance at meetings, workshops and reading email correspondence) |
| Secondary Data | Academic research and case studies  
Acts of Parliament  
Archived emails  
Australian Bureau of Statistics publications  
Consultant’s studies and reports  
Government reports  
Historical photographs  
Maps  
Media reports (local and national newspaper articles, website articles and television programs)  
Minutes of meetings  
Organisation strategic reports (e.g. opportunity plans, strategic plans and annual reports)  
Organisation websites (both current and no longer existing)  
Parliamentary debates  
Tourism Research Australia publications  
Tourist infrastructure (e.g. interpretative signs and lookouts)  
Tourism marketing materials |

Source: Developed for this research
An important consideration is the type of interview to be used (Jennings 2001, 2005; McGehee 2012). In providing a historical analysis and literature review on interviewing, Fontana and Frey (1994) have described, compared and contrasted the various interview forms. As can be seen in Figure 4.6, interview types, like most methodological considerations, exist along a continuum (Bryman 2004). The interviews conducted in this research were designed to fit somewhere along the continuum between semi-structured interviews and unstructured interviews. The justification for this was primarily that to obtain deep insights into the interests, perspectives and tensions of the lateral actors being interviewed, it was essential to follow an open interview process. A completely unstructured interview design, which allows the participant to lead the interview (Jennings 2005), was considered inappropriate in that the study was necessarily focused on predetermined research objectives. Therefore, a semi-structured interview approach was adopted.

Figure 4.6 Continuum of Interview Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structured Interview</th>
<th>Semi-structured</th>
<th>Unstructured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed questioning, with predetermined answers</td>
<td>Open questions, but reliant on prompt list</td>
<td>Open questioning, where the research allows the respondent to guide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Fontana and Frey (1994) and Jennings (2001)

Bryman and Bell (2007) argue that semi-structured interviews are open enough to allow the researcher to gain insight into values, attitudes and perceptions while also being structured enough to provide cross-case comparison at the analysis stage and to ensure the researcher can answer the research questions. Along the same lines, Jennings (2001) has suggested that a semi-structured approach to interviewing provides a more relaxed environment, allows for clarification and deeper exploration, and ensures that the researcher does not lose control over the interview process. These points justify the decision to employ this form of interviewing for this thesis. The specific procedures that were followed in recruiting and conducting the interviews are described hereafter.

Yin (2009) emphasises the need for developing a research protocol when completing fieldwork to ensure consistency, reliability and validity, and to enhance the overall quality of the data collected and of the findings contributed to broadening knowledge. The first main stage of the interview procedure was the recruitment of the participants considered appropriate to provide insight on behalf of the lateral actor organisations in which they were involved. The process was designed as follows.

25 Although the participants were expected to be best situated to respond on behalf of their organisations, it is not possible to conclude that their personal perspectives did not ‘colour’ their responses. An example
1. An email was sent directly to the potential participant. The email briefly explained the research project and directed the potential participant to an attached project summary sheet and research information sheet.

2. Most of the potential participants responded to the email, while the rest were followed up by telephone.

3. The participants elected a preferred date and the researcher followed this up with a telephone call to make an appointment time and confirm the location of the interview (in some cases the appointment was made with the secretary of the participant).

4. Within the week prior to the interview, an email was sent reminding each participant of the time and location of the interview appointment and requesting that the interviewee complete the attached informed consent form. The project summary sheet and research information sheet were again attached to this email in case the participant had misplaced the previous email.

5. In the case of face-to-face interviews, the researcher arrived at each location five minutes prior to the interview time and had blank copies of the informed consent form and research information sheets (most of the participants had not printed and completed the consent form prior to the interview). For telephone interviews, the researcher telephoned at the time of the interview and ensured that the participant had the email, fax and postal details of the researcher so that they could return the completed form. The researcher also ensured that the participants understood the information contained within this sheet.

This process of participant recruitment was considered justified as the persons being contacted were rarely contactable directly by telephone, mainly because the very nature of their positions required them to be out of their offices much of the time. Thanks to initial contact being made via email, the participants were given the opportunity to “digest” information about the project at their own pace, while they were also able to consider whether to participate or not. It was recognised throughout the research process that most of the email responses that the researcher received from participants were sent outside of office hours. Furthermore, by using email contact, the researcher could obtain the potential participants’ mobile telephone number, making the research process more efficient by minimising the constant exchange of voicemail messages.

The issue of collecting data from executives and elites is an area of substantial interest in the management (Bryman & Bell 2007; Ticehurst & Veal 1999; Zikmund 2003) and broader research literature (Hertz & Imber 1995; Kvale 2009; Zuckermann 1977). The research process carried out for this project dealt well with the challenges of recruiting these participants.

of this was a State Government employee who said that he supported the Straight Border Society, which would certainly not be a policy of the department for which he worked.
Three themes that dominate the interview practice literature are the issues of developing an interview guide, the establishment of rapport and the recording of interviews. According to Oakley (1981), an interview is a pseudo-conversation guided by a set of rules. Others agree that interviewing is a process of consistent inquiry that is more than likely to be fluid rather than rigid, but one that is guided in some form by the interviewer (Gubrium & Holstein 1997; Rubin & Rubin 1995; Yin 2003). A common method for guiding interviews when employing a semi-structured interview approach is for the researcher to have ‘a prompt list of issues that focus the interaction’ (Jennings 2001: 165; Yin 2009). Following this suggestion, the researcher did develop a list of prompts to ensure that each interview covered the topics of relevance to the research questions (see Section 1.2). While these prompts were developed to guide each interview, the lines of conversation aimed to follow the thoughts of the interviewees, with the interviewer guiding the interview mainly when the interview appeared to be going too far ‘off topic’. Such an approach had the benefit of revealing insight into topics not specifically related to the prompts the researcher had developed but that, in an unexpected way, contributed to the prompt points and research questions.

As a broad variety of lateral actors were interviewed, a separate prompt list was developed prior to each interview to ensure that the prompts were relevant to each actor and to minimise the risk of the actor having difficulty in understanding the line of questioning. This was particularly the case for actors less involved specifically in tourism, who were less likely to be familiar with terms commonly used among tourism professionals, such as “regional tourism organisation” and abbreviations, such as “RTO”, which were even less recognised. A similar point relates to the willingness of some to speak openly around what could be a politically sensitive topic.

While some interviewees were extremely closed, others were the complete opposite. The most closed interview was one where the researcher was met with the abrupt message on arrival at the interviewee’s office that the interviewee only had ‘half an hour available’ for what was supposed to be up to an hour-long interview. On the other hand, the longest interview took place in a café that was in the process of attempting to shut, with the interview continuing for just over two and a half hours. Most of the interviews were around one hour long, with few shorter than 55 minutes and only one over one and a half hours. Most of the face-to-face interviews took place in the interviewee’s office, while a small number were conducted in cafés and three were conducted in meeting rooms at the Southern Cross University Gold Coast campus. All telephone interviews were completed in the respective offices of the interviewees and interviewer.
The issue of extracting information from closed interviewees has been a major feature of the research literature. An important method of gaining further insight from such interviewees is the researcher making a concerted effort to develop rapport (Neuman 2006; Oakley 1981). While those such as Ticehurst and Veal (1999: 100) hold the belief ‘the interviewer is meant to listen and encourage the respondent to talk – not to engage in debate’, others believe that the researcher must engage with the interviewee to develop trust and greater openness (Fontana & Frey 1994; Hermanns 2004; Oakley 1981).

The researcher balanced these demands by using a line of questioning that was broad and all-encompassing with more detailed questioning about specific events and information that would show the local knowledge of the interviewee. Engaging the interviewees in this way led them to see the researcher as less of an outsider and, as such, as more trustworthy. Not only did this approach have this benefit, but it also heightened the level of interest the interviewees had in contributing to the research as they could see its relevance.

To further ensure that the highest quality data was obtained from each interview, techniques of best practice in interviewing were employed. These were drawn from the interviewing literature (particularly Fontana & Frey 1994; Gubrium & Holstein 1997; Holstein & Gubrium 1995; Kvale 2009; Rubin & Rubin 1995) and were based around three main interview stages.

**Stage 1 – Briefing.** Each interview began with the interviewer explaining the purpose of the interview, ensuring that the informed consent form was completed, that the interviewees were willing for the interview to be recorded and the participant was given the opportunity to ask any questions. At this stage, only one participant did not wish for the interview to be recorded, mainly because she felt that she would not be able to respond as openly with the recorder running. The first questions were of limited complexity and political sensitivity (e.g. “What are the strengths and weaknesses of your region?”). This allowed for greater rapport to develop, gave the interviewee time to settle into an unfamiliar conversational environment and gave the researcher an idea of the interviewee’s perspective of the limit of “their region”.

**Stage 2 – Main Questioning.** Following initial questioning, the topics discussed became increasingly complex and touched on issues with greater political sensitivity. The researcher made a concerted effort to make all questions as brief as possible to ensure the interviewee was the main person speaking and followed the interviewee’s points with paraphrased responses to ensure understanding (Fontana & Frey 1994). As well as eliciting factual and narrative information using more passive questions, the researcher also used confrontational questioning, sparingly, to cause the interviewee to question their points, perspectives and views (Kvale 2009). This did not necessarily involve the researcher aggressively asserting his

---

26 This is an additional benefit of using an abductive approach to theorising, as discussed in Section 4.5.
opinions, but rather involved asking questions that caused further thinking. An example of this was to ask such questions as “How do you think the actors on the other side of the border felt/would feel about that?” While this method of interviewing can be counter-productive, in the case of well-educated and constantly questioning managers, it was appropriate (Kvale 2009). Minimal notes were taken during the interview as this can distract the interviewee and can limit the level of rapport attainable (Fontana & Frey 1994). All the interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder, except for one interview where the participant did not feel they could speak as openly with a recorder running. In this case, notes were taken during and after the interview.

Stage 3 – Closing. Kvale (2009) has warned that the last stage of an interview can provoke two kinds of feelings in the interviewee. The first is a feeling of emptiness caused by the fact they have provided a lot of information with little in return; the second, a feeling of being enriched following an enjoyable conversation with an attentive listener. In all cases, the interviews appeared to end with the interviewee in a positive, yet thought-provoked, mindset (as per Patton 1990). Three of the interviewees contacted the researcher soon after the interview with some level of concern about having disclosed too much information, suggesting that the political nature of the topic had not negatively influenced the amount of information provided. This could also suggest some level of anxiety. To minimise this feeling, each interview ended with a debriefing that summed up the interview and ensured that the participant did not wish to make any further comments. This issue is discussed further in Section 4.6, which deals with research ethics.

During the 1990s, Silverman (Atkinson & Silverman 1998; 1993) posited that increasingly, we are living in an “interview society” due to the prevalence of interviewing in many parts of everyday life. This rise of the “interview society” has led Holstein and Gubrium (2003: 68) to conclude that people are more willing to passively accept interview data without question. The authors argue that researchers, in a quest to keep interviewer and participant interaction ‘in check’, have forgotten that, in all research involving qualitative interviewing, the researcher is always active.

Following these ideas, this researcher acknowledges that the way in which participants were selected, the line of questioning used in the interviews and the background of the researcher would have affected the processes followed in data analysis. While some holding a positivist perspective would see this as an issue of validity, those such as Corbin and Strauss (2008), as well as Tracy (2010), see this diversity of understanding as the strength of qualitative research. A further strength of the approach was the inclusion of other data collection methods and sources in providing a crystallised perspective of the situation.
4.4.3 PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

Participant observation has been described as ‘intensive fieldwork in which the investigator is immersed in the culture under study’ (Patton 1990: 67). Based in anthropology, participant observation has been an area of interest in the research literature for more than half a century. A large amount of the interest has been in categorising the various forms that participant observation can take. This has mainly involved determining the extent to which a researcher holds the traditional role of the objective, positivist observer as opposed to complete immersion in the field research (e.g. Adler & Adler 1983; Gans 1982; Gold 1969; Junker 1960; Riberio & Foemmel 2012).

Yin (2009: 109) has posited that participant observation is commonly paired with interviews in case study research, as the data collection methods are complementary in projects that are not ‘purely historical’. It is claimed that interviews and participant observation have their own advantages and disadvantages and that, when used together, they have the potential for the researcher to develop a fuller picture of a phenomenon (Atkinson & Coffey 2003). In this research, participant observation had the specific benefits of insight emerging in a natural environment, highlighted points that the actors were willing to discuss in a public environment (including in the presence of actors from other LGAs) and to identify areas where the lateral actors agreed or shared common interests. Using participant observation also provided the researcher with the opportunity to determine issues requiring further probing during confidential interviews, where the discussion had more freedom.

The participant observation that occurred in this research involved the researcher attending meetings and participating in email correspondence. In these situations, the researcher would be best described within the three main categorisations as taking an ‘observer as participant’ (Junker 1960), being a ‘researcher participant’ (Gans 1982), or playing a ‘peripheral membership role’ (Adler & Adler 1983). This meant that the researcher was involved rather than simply being an observer, but inclusion was limited as much as possible. Four meetings with lateral actors from two of the tourism management episodes were attended in the case study region. As the Rainforest Way had been disbanded by the time of data collection, no meetings could be attended for this episode. While it was planned that the researcher would attend further meetings during the tourism management episodes, no further meetings were organised by the actors (which provided some insight into their operation). The researcher was involved in email correspondence following these meetings between meeting participants. In most cases, the researcher was expected to silently read this correspondence, while in a small number of cases, the researcher was asked for his perspective and expertise. As is explained in Section 4.6, the researcher acted in the ‘observer as participant’ role in such situations.
In accordance with Runcie (1976) and Sarantakos (2005), access to the meetings and email correspondence was negotiated with key stakeholders in each tourism management episode. To ensure that there were no ethical concerns or suspicion around the presence of the researcher, it was ensured that the purpose of the research was known and the use of participant observation brought to the attention of all those involved. In three settings, the researcher was simply ignored and the meetings took their normal course. In the fourth situation, which was made up of a relatively small number of participants, it appeared that the participants felt proud that their project had been selected for a research project and resulted in the participants, in some cases, making an extra effort to involve the researcher. During the meetings, the researcher took notes on important points and, when the researcher was involved in discussion, he mainly asked questions.

4.4.4 Secondary Data

According to Yin (2009: 101, 13) ‘[e]xcept for studies of preliterate societies, documentary information is likely to be relevant for every case study topic’, while ‘[p]hysical artefacts have less potential relevance in the most typical kind of case study’. The author emphasises that, in regards to both sources of data, the information contained within them has distinct advantages over both interviews and participant observation. The information often relates to specific details not readily available through oral communication, allowing for interview and participant observation to be corroborated and expanded on. Furthermore, information was provided that could be utilised in developing interview questions (Yin 2003). Finally, secondary data allow for retrospective inquiry and often provide information not available through any other source, such as tourism visitation figures (Hodder 2000; Jennings 2001). In terms of the border studies literature, an important point that has been made is the argument that border narratives are legitimised by numerous sources, including ‘archives, maps, folklore, storytelling, old markers or even the physical landscape itself’ (Paül & Trillo-Santamaria 2014: 6). As can be seen in Table 4.2 (on page 79), a range of secondary sources have been used to gain insight and contribute to answering the research questions posed in the research. The main categories of evidence were collected in differing ways, as follows.

Documents. These included annual reports, strategic plans, consultants’ reports and newspaper articles. These were generally publicly available on the internet. Most of these sources were found through internet search engines and several keywords. Some of these documents were found based on the suggestions of research participants and were either provided by the participants or keywords were provided to allow for the file to be found online. In some cases, newspaper clippings were also taken directly from local newspapers, collected by the research or sent by one of the researcher’s colleagues who lived in the border region.
Records. This form of evidence included Acts of Parliament, parliamentary debates and
government reports. These were also mainly available from the internet, even though
government documents were often more difficult to uncover, requiring online search engines
specifically for searching specific types of records (e.g. Hansard).

Artefacts. Hodder (2000: 394) has stated, in discussing artefacts in research, ‘that material traces
of behaviour give an important and different insight from that provided by any number of
questionnaires’. Following this logic, this research gained insight by collecting and analysing
tourism artefacts. These included tourist brochures, tourist signage and other tourist
paraphernalia, such as tourism attractions in the case study region. Interviewees provided some
of these artefacts, others were found in electronic form online and others were collected on the
researcher’s travels during data collection.

Historical photographs. The collection of historical photographs, particularly when paired with
historical documents (such as newspaper articles), provided an important means for
understanding the history of the border region and the historical antecedents that continue to
impact collaborative efforts in the border regions in contemporary times. Historical photographs
were collected using specialised search engines and were sourced primarily from state and
national libraries and archives. In some cases, photographs were archived by the public
broadcaster, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (commonly referred to as the ABC).

Maps. This form of evidence was instrumental in describing and situating the case study region
and its boundaries (see Section 4.3.1). Maps were also analysed to understand the regional
perceptions and focus of different organisations that are in and influence the border region.
Maps also assisted in the description of the findings. Some maps were collected from existing
sources, including official websites and reports, while others were produced by the researcher.
The maps produced by the researcher were developed using Google Earth, using standard layers
included in the package and layers imported specifically for the project.

4.5 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

Law (2004; 2007: 595) argues ‘the world is mainly mess’. He explains that this is not
necessarily an issue if methodological approaches are accepted by social science researchers
that assist ‘in knowing mess’. He argues that many current methods are not terribly good at
doing this. His message is that social phenomena, such as the focus of this thesis, cannot be
neatly categorised by researchers, and when this does occur, important meaning is lost. Dredge
and Hales (2012b: 5) have made the point that, in the past, ‘researchers often found themselves
trying to create the illusion of a rational scientific approach, when their research was much more
organic and creative’. Discussing ‘social messes’, Horn (2001: 1) maintains social phenomena
require methodological approaches that acknowledge the complications, complexities,
ambiguity, inter-connectedness, illogicalness and varied points of view involved with an issue. Following this logic, an analytical narrative approach has been used in this thesis.

The approach involved the interpretation of the various sources of data collected using an abductive process of theorising (described further below), which was developed into several narratives that provide new meaning. To an extent, the analytical approach can be simply explained as follows (Czarniawska 1997: 69):

When attempts to collect materials from the field have been successful, the researcher is rewarded with a pile of texts, some are written in numbers, some in words; in my own case, some were written by me (e.g. interview records and field notes) and some by other people (e.g. documents and press clippings). This does not matter all that much; the task is to interpret them and to come up with a new text that will bear this interpretation.

For this thesis, the researcher transcribed all of the recorded interviews. This reflects the approach commonly accepted in the interview literature (Gubrium & Holstein 1997, 2003; Holstein & Gubrium 1995; Holstein & Gubrium 2003; Kvale 2009; Laurier 1999). The remainder of the data, including the researcher’s own field notes, were analysed following an abductive approach.

Although said to have been traced back to Aristotle (Reichertz 2004), the most commonly recognised modern proponent of abductive theorising was Peirce (1973, 1992), a pragmatist who recognised the approach had potential in a scientific community that relied mainly on deductive and, on occasion, inductive theorising. Reichertz (2010: 4) contends this approach to theorising ‘is sensible and scientific as a form of inference, however, it reaches to the sphere of deep insight and new knowledge’. Abductive theorising does not aim to develop and test hypotheses derived from the literature, as is done in deductive theorising, or completely rely on empirical data to develop completely new theories from grounded data, as is the case in the inductive approach. Rather, abductive theorising is a process where the researcher accepts that ‘data are to be taken seriously, and the validity of previously developed knowledge is to be queried’ (Reichertz 2010: 4). This form of inference and theorising was considered the most appropriate in a study that aimed to query existing theories in a little understood context.

An approach to data analysis that accepts this form of theorising is the approach of Corbin and Strauss (2008), drawn from the lifetime work of Strauss (1987; Strauss & Corbin 1990, 1994) and based on the work of the pioneers of Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss 1967). Following this pioneering work, Glaser (1992) continued to argue for a purely inductive approach to qualitative data analysis, while Strauss accepted the impossibility of truly inductive theorising and, as such, accepted abduction. This can be seen in the most recent writing of Corbin and
Strauss (2008) suggesting researchers bring a background to the data analysis process. In a similar vein, Sandelowski (1993: 214) has argued ‘insights into data do not happen haphazardly, they happen to prepared minds during interplay with the data. Theories, professional knowledge that we carry in our heads, inform our research in multiple ways, even if quite subconsciously’.

Dey (1993) holds a similar view, highlighting the benefit that can result from recognising the importance of holding a prepared mind that accepts both newly collected data and existing knowledge in an abductive process of theorising. Furthermore, the author posits that qualitative analysis transfixed on coding and breaking down collected data can miss the important point of considering the whole picture or questioning what the whole picture may be. As such, while the current research did employ some coding and categorising of data (using *Nvivo* 10, under the guidance of Bazeley (2007) and *QSR International* (2010a, 2010b)), each data source was treated as a complete narrative rather than broken down excerpts. It was considered important that each of the quotes and points of interest needed to be read in the context of the narrative from which it was derived to maintain the overall meaning.

Several approaches exist for interpreting and transforming collected narratives into new information and theories, with the most prominent being socio-linguistic and sociocultural approaches (Grbich 2007). As these approaches are very much focused on understanding specific aspects of sociology neither appeared particularly applicable in this thesis. One approach to the analysis of narratives in their entirety is the work of Czarniawska (1997, 2004, 2008a, 2008b) on organisational narratives. This is the approach that was used in this research. It involves the researcher reading the collected data sources in two ways, both as what Eco (1990, 1992) labels a semantic (naïve) reader and a semiotic (critical) reader. Czarniawska (1997: 72) proposes that an academic researcher must read each narrative collected passively and then “value add” by completing a critical reading that incorporates comparison with other collected data and with existing academic knowledge.

Specifically, in the case of tourism research, it has been posited that storytelling and narrative analysis can ‘enhance understandings of the complex world in which tourism planning and policy takes place’, and provide a means to ‘interrogate events, decisions and actions’ in the daily lives of individuals (Dredge & Jenkins 2011: 1, 6). A similar point has been made by researchers focused on border processes, who state that the ‘study of narratives and discourse is central to an understanding of all types of boundaries’ (Newman & Paasi 1998: 201). Others have argued that narrative approaches provide a means for theory generation through rich description and highly contextualised accounts (Colquitt & Zapata-Phelan 2007; Czarniawska 2008a, 2010; Dawson & Hjorth 2012; Geertz 1973; Mintzberg 2005; Pheonix 2008; Squire, Andrews & Tambunan 2008).
Following the logic of many qualitative researchers (e.g. Chronis 2012; Coffey & Atkinson 1996; Corbin & Strauss 2008; Denzin & Lincoln 1994b; Gummesson 2006), the process of data analysis in this research was not removed from the other research processes conducted. Rather, the analysis, both from a semantic and a semiotic perspective, took place throughout the data collection and write up stages. While the initial analysis that took place – while collecting data – was mainly semantic, as the research continued, a more semiotic reading of the data ensued. This is a very similar approach to the one reflected on by Mintzberg (2005) in his development of theory.

An important consideration in qualitative research design is the display of the research findings (Brown 1994; Brown, Pressland & Rogers 1993; Chenail, Duffy, St George & Wulff 2011; Huberman & Miles 2002). In this thesis, the context of the case study region is reported in Chapters 5 and 6, while the embedded cases are introduced in Chapter 7. The following two chapters centre on the themes, which includes excerpts from the empirical sources, as well as discussion, critical analysis, interpretation and explanation of these sources, in conjunction with the insights gained from the existing literature (reported in Chapters 2 and 3). The writing process itself reflected that described by Evans (2013) and Mintzberg (2005) involving a cycle of amassing sources, engaging with the sources, generating ideas and ‘aha moments’ (Evans 2013: 12).

4.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Qualitative research is inherently fluid, flexible and involves continual judgements by the researcher as to what is noteworthy (Bryman & Bell 2007; Ryan 2005; Tracy 2010). This can be seen in Janesick (1994), who likened the qualitative research process to that of a dance, and in Patton (1980: 159), who suggested that ‘fieldwork is a creative process’ that loses its relevance if it is too structured and too far removed from ongoing judgements by the researcher. For these reasons, it has been recognised that the consideration of ethics must be an ongoing duty of the researcher while in the field (Punch 1994). In fact, some have claimed the enforcement of certain ethical guidelines in qualitative research can be highly constricive (Ryan 2005; Silverman 2006). Despite such arguments, it is commonly recognised that the design of qualitative methodologies must ensure that all foreseeable risks are recognised and mitigated (Patton 2002; Punch 2007; Silverman 2006) and hence ensure a mixture of procedures and personal virtues (Kvale 2009). In this research, the researcher reviewed the range of risks that can occur in social science research and ensured that procedures had been designed to mitigate any risks.
It was recognised that a primary ethical concern was that of confidentiality. Due to the inherently political nature of the research topic, involving the discussion of how different organisations and individuals within these organisations relate to one another, specific reference to such perspectives were potentially damaging to individuals and relationships. This became increasingly clear when the researcher realised that some points raised by some interview respondents had the potential to result in significant divisions and conflict between actors in the region. This was also evident in that some of the participants telephoned the researcher soon after the interviews to ensure that the interview recording would not be available to anyone other than the interviewer, as they “really opened up”.

Due to the limited number of participants and focus on the context of the participants and phenomenon, this is an important concern (Flick 2004). To overcome this issue, the research was designed in such a way as to include anonymity and to make sure the participants understood that the research would be published at a later stage. Specifically, none of the participants have been named in the research presented (instead they have been labelled as Participant n) and prior to each interview, the potential participants were provided with an information sheet and verbally reminded that the research would be published once complete (normally at the same time as they were asked if they were willing to have the interview recorded). When consenting involvement in the research, the participants were given the opportunity to indicate their interest in receiving a summary of the research findings. Those participants who indicated an interest will be provided with a brief overview of the main findings following the thesis examination process. An emailed factsheet format was deemed suitable, as the participants had limited time and were reached most effectively through an electronic channel.

A second ethical issue inherent in the research was the influence that the researcher could potentially have on the tourism management episodes through contact with network participants and particularly when employing the participant observation technique. While most forms of research that involve contact with research participants have the potential to influence the behaviour of such people, even if this is simply causing them to think (Jennings 2001, 2005), it has long been recognised that research projects employing participant observation have the potential to exert the most influence (Neuman 2006).

As was discussed in Section 4.4.3, in conducting the participant observation, in most situations the researcher was simply left as an observer. In one instance, the researcher was encouraged to be involved in the initiative, even after “leaving the field”. The reason for this encouragement could have been that the researcher was perceived as an expert who could assist in the success of the tourism initiative that they were working on. This provided the researcher with conflicting interests in that while the researcher wished to support the initiative and share any
knowledge of use with the network actors, he did not want to overtly influence the initiative and impact the episode under study. Furthermore, the researcher did not wish to cloud their judgement regarding the episode under study. The researcher approached this issue by providing minimal insight, but when it was felt necessary to provide some form of insight – such as in a situation where the researcher was asked “What do you think?” – the researcher would mainly provide responses in the form of questions to spur further discussion. The rationale for this was based on the decision, made during the design stage, that the interviewer would assume the role of Gold’s (1958) “observer as participant”, rather than that of a more involved participant. Such an approach is important as a means of ensuring ethical research conduct when using the participant observation research methodology (Jackson 1983; Neuman 2006). Other perspectives do exist, such as Flyvbjerg’s (2004) phonetic approach, but they rely on the researcher being able to offer an expert’s perspective. As the researcher was studying the topic area but made no claim to hold expertise as a practitioner, making comments would not be appropriate.

The third ethical issue in conducting the research was the loss of productive time for each participant. Writing from the perspective of the tourism consumer researcher, Leiper (2004) has suggested that participation in research is an interruption to the tourist’s holiday activities. In a similar way, participation in the interview component of this research resulted in an interruption to the normal work of the participants. While the benefits of the research outcomes were considered to outweigh this negative aspect, the research was designed in such a way as to minimise this impact. This was done by providing the participants with the option for the research to be conducted at a time and place that suited them, while keeping within the resource constraints of the research. This included the interviews mainly taking place at the office of the participant or in a nearby café. It was also planned that each interview would take no longer than an hour, with only a small number longer than this, due to the participant’s willingness to continue.

Finally, each participant was provided with a research information sheet and informed consent form, which required completion prior to interviews taking place. Furthermore, to ensure that the research did not pose ethical risks, the researcher’s supervisors, the School of Business and Tourism PhD Confirmation Committee and the University Ethics Committee reviewed the research plan.
4.7 Conclusion

This chapter addressed Research Objective 2, which is to develop a conceptual framework and research approach to explore tourism management in border regions that acknowledges the complexity of CBTM. Building on the mainly internationally focused literature reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3, the chapter contributed a conceptual framework and research approach that guided the research undertaken to make a significant contribution to knowledge with regards to the opportunities and challenges for CBTM in subnational border regions. This provides a clear contribution to knowledge by responding to the call for research for further conceptualisation of borders and border regions (Newman 2006a). It was shown that no existing framework was capable of understanding the issues of concern in the study, and that it was necessary to develop one.

Drawing on the earlier chapters of this thesis, the conceptual framework and research approach were developed with due reference to a range of issues. Specifically, the approach addressed the following aspects:

- Border regions are negotiated liminal spaces existing within a unique context and situation (Newman & Paasi 1998).
- Tourism management often involves ‘multiple actors with diverse goals’ (Phi et al. 2010: 1), often with limited consensus (Rumford 2012).
- Tourism management in border regions is a wicked problem, characterised as being difficult to define and involving multiple interdependencies. Wicked problems are multi-causal, unstable, socially complex, and rarely sit within a single organisation’s responsibility (Australian Public Service Commission 2007; Phi et al. 2010; Rittel & Webber 1973).

It was recognised that CBTM in subnational border regions exist in a ‘world that is mainly messy’, and rather than trying to make ‘the world clean and neat’ (Law 2004; 2007: 595), this thesis developed a research approach that embraced the ‘messiness’, with the aim of overcoming the weaknesses and flaws of existing frameworks that have produced “black spots” in our understanding.

A social constructionist perspective was accepted as the over-arching paradigm of the research, as it allowed for empathetic understanding of multiple realities and human agency, while considering the formation of phenomena and processes in a social context. Acceptance of this paradigm was further justified as border regions are negotiated spaces where multiple realities and perspectives exist. A social constructionist approach acknowledges messiness, and such an approach is more ‘critical, situated and emic’ than other approaches. Finally, the approach
allowed for a more complete account of ‘the connectedness of things, places, and people’ (Pernecky 2010: 2) in the border region.

A qualitative, embedded case study approach was developed, allowing for multiple perspectives to be considered within the context and situation of a specific Australian subnational border region. The analysis of actors at multiple scales within different CBTMEs within the border region allowed for deeper insights into the processes and relations involved in CBTM. This approach also allowed the researcher to investigate CBTM over time and space – as efforts began, changed and eventually declined. Very few studies have empirically considered the CBTM process across time and space, even though CBTM does not exist in a vacuum at only one point in time or in a single bounded space.

The use of multiple sources of data – including a variety of secondary materials, semi-structured interviews and participant observations – and the use of crystallisation of the data provided thick descriptions, complexly rendered interpretations and reflected multiple perspectives. This meant a more complete picture of CBTM was possible. The overall contribution of the research was also enhanced by the abductive approach to analysis. This approach allowed for multiple perspectives to be recognised, while enhancing understanding of the complexity of CBTM, by interrogating the tourism episodes, as well as the existing literature.

While much of the existing literature has studied CBTM as a static concept at a single point in time and space, and often at a single scale, this research has contributed a conceptual framework and research approach that investigates cross-border tourism phenomena as the messy and fluid phenomena they are. Rather than focusing on border regions and actors in border regions as the units of analysis, this research is among the first to specifically focus on cross-border episodes – allowing for consideration of concrete efforts in practice. The following chapter is the first of three that considers the context of these CTBMEs.
5 THE FORMING OF AN AUSTRALIAN BORDER REGION

This chapter is the first of three that aims to contribute to Research Objective 3, which is to critically examine the South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for CBTM. Based on the premise that border regions are heterogeneous and contextual, the chapter is the first of two to consider the situation and context of the border region. It is structured in such a way as to provide a brief history of the formation of the political border and describes the resulting border region. It concludes by evaluating the functional and social boundaries that existed at the time of this research. Chapter 6, which follows, considers aspects of the border region at the time of this study in further detail.

5.1 BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CASE STUDY BORDER

The first borders in the border region were those of the Indigenous people, who lived there long before European settlement. Due to the lack of acknowledgement by Europeans of the existence of aboriginals and the determination that Australia was Terra Nullius, no formal acknowledgement of these borders existed. It was not until well after the formation of the current borders that Tindale and Mumford (1940, 1974) produced one of the most detailed works on Aboriginal language use across Australia. Their work included a map showing that at least six Indigenous languages, and associated clans, existed in the border region under study in this thesis. None of the political-administrative boundaries in place today follow these Indigenous borders (Sarre & Putt 2016).

The earliest records of Australia’s borders by Europeans go back to the mappings of parts of the coast by Willem Janszoon and Abel Tasman, whose coastline charters show the parts of Australia that were known to the Dutch in 1664, when Australia was known as New Holland (Pinkerton 2001; Taylor 2006). It was not until 1770 that much of the east coast – which is now the most populated area of the country – was recognised on a voyage by Captain James Cook. It is then that it was claimed as British land and named the colony of New South Wales, noting that the coastline resembled the coastline of South Wales in Britain.

In January 1788, Captain Arthur Phillip led the First Fleet to Botany Bay, and then to Port Phillip, which later became Sydney. The Second Fleet included the first of the British convicts who were transported to Australia, to deal with overpopulation of British Prisons in 1790 (Department of Finance and Deregulation 2008). Over the ensuing years, further fleets arrived

---

27 This decision was later to come under fire in a discussion piece (Vetch 1838) that questioned the appropriateness of such a name for such a long and diverse coastline. The same paper also criticises the unimaginative and confusing uses of British place names in many other instances in British colonies.
and new colonies were established. In the case of Queensland, which was originally a northern part of NSW, interest in colonising the region arose because of the need to deal with what were labelled “intractable convicts” in Port Phillip (Sydney). It was suggested that Point Curtin (now Gladstone, north of Brisbane) was a suitable site, but the first detachment to the north was to Moreton Bay and was led by Captain John Oxley in 1823. After three months, a decision was made to move to the banks of the Brisbane River, which, 16 years later, was officially recognised as the free settlement of Brisbane Town (Taylor 2006).

The detachment of Brisbane Town saw significant speculation on the northern region of NSW becoming a separate colony. In 1840, the Clarence River (now in the Northern Rivers, in the northern-most part of the current State of NSW) was surveyed with a view to establishing an alternative shipping route to Sydney for a northern colony. Carney (2013: 1), detailing the ‘land borders of the Australian state’, stated that the formation and positioning of the NSW-QLD border ‘aroused more controversy and debate than any other Australian land boundary’ (22). Between 1840 and 1858, political debate and public action both for and against the separation of a northern colony was significant, with a variety of separation movements and associations formed and numerous petitions being sent to the NSW Legislative Assembly and the British Parliament (further detail is available in Appendix C). The tussle as to whether the separation would occur was an important issue, as was consideration as to where the new border would be located, should separation occur (Taylor 2006).

Although several British intellectuals, such as Vetch (1838), had made recommendations on how to divide Australia (see, for example, Figure 5.1), Dr John Lang was a strong Australian-based advocate for the numerous separation movements that took place in central, northern and southern NSW. In his lectures and books, he made a case for ensuring that any new northern colonies would not be separated any further north than the 30th parallel, to not politically marginalise what is now known as the Northern Rivers in NSW and South-East QLD (Lang 1850). After years of debate and petitions being sent across the world, Henry Earl Grey, who was responsible for the “Colonial Possessions” of the British Empire, claimed numerous times that the separation of the northern part of NSW was not a matter of priority for the Empire.

In 1858, the British Parliament finally made the decision to form a new colony at the 30th parallel. While Lang and the separation movement saw this decision as positive for all involved, the final decision was at the discretion of the NSW Legislative Assembly in Sydney, which (reportedly behind closed doors and through substantial political jostling; Taylor 2006) decided to form the new colony at 28’8” south, starting at Point Danger on the coast and
following the Macpherson Ranges\textsuperscript{28}, before eventually following a number of rivers and then the 29\textsuperscript{th} parallel west to the South Australian border (Department of Environment and Resource Management 2009). At the end of that year, the colony was formed and named Queensland, on the recommendation of Queen Victoria (Taylor 2006).

Figure 5.1 States of Australia Recommended by Captain Vetch in 1838

Joint surveying of the border shared by NSW and QLD began in 1862, at which time significant angst was building in the Northern Rivers and New England region in the north-east part of the newly formed NSW, which bordered the new colony of QLD. Several associations, such as the Grafton Improvement Association, and separation movements driven by petitions led by Lang pursued the idea of either annexation to QLD or formation of a new colony in Northern NSW, often recommending the name New England. Lang passionately argued that the decision of the Legislative Council to separate north of the 30\textsuperscript{th} parallel had, as he predicted, negatively impacted the northern part of the newly formed NSW, which, while geographically and economically close to Brisbane, was politically connected to Sydney (Taylor 2006). In fact, Taylor (2006: 242) reports:

\begin{itemize}
\item Specificity, the border was said to exist between two rivers on either side of the mountain range (Carney 2013).
\end{itemize}
The decisions made by Sydney officialdom all too often revealed that there was a lack of sympathetic understanding concerning the everyday needs of the lonely bush dweller.

Lang also made attempts to assist the Riverina Movement in Southern NSW. However, at an *All Australian New State Movement* held in Albury, NSW in 1922, it was decided that the Northern and Southern NSW regions did not share enough issues and concerns to warrant greater collaboration. It was recognised, nonetheless, that the regions shared common issues in that they were faced with a tyranny of distance from Sydney and felt they were experiencing a lack of proper government administration (Taylor 2006). This recognition by the “new state” advocates reinforces suggestions that, even within the same country, each border region has a unique context and situation, making comparison and general theories difficult to develop (Chen 2005; Paasi 2009, 2010; Sidaway 2011; Zimmerbauer 2011).

In 1935, the NSW Government appointed the Nicholas Royal Commission to consider the administrative regions of NSW. It recommended that NSW be divided into three regions, with a referendum in the northern parts of the state to initiate the process. Since the failed referendum, no changes have occurred regarding the boundaries of any Australian States, except for local council boundaries within States. However, it has been reported that separation movements continue to this day and some have claimed the current geopolitical division will eventually change, whether through the establishment of new states or through the removal of states altogether (e.g. Bell 2006; Lewis 2005; Murphy 2005; O’Brien 2016; Singleton 2012; Taylor 2006; The Guardian 2016). Under the Australian Constitution, this would require a referendum, and referendums have a very limited history of being carried (Australian Electoral Commission 2016).

The border region has deep historical-political roots, beginning from its very formation through borderlanders and those with political interests in the capital cities of Brisbane and particularly Sydney having a significant impact on border processes. This view of each State being directly linked to the respective capital city has a legacy that plays out today. The formation of the border also illustrates the background role that the Federal Government has played in being constitutionally unable to contribute to integrating border regions between Australian States. The continued influence of the States, at times to the detriment of borderlanders, is seen in the border processes since the formation of the border region. This brief history of the formation of the border region reinforces the point ‘that rather than neutral lines, borders are often pools of emotions, fears and memories that can be mobilized apace for both progressive and regressive purposes’ (Johnson *et al.* 2011: 62).
5.2 **Acculturation at the Borderlands**

The study of Australia’s border regions has been very limited. The most notable examples of work done on Australia’s state borders (Carney 2013; Taylor 2006) have dealt almost exclusively with the history of the formation of States and Territories. Their borders were political-administrative boundaries; set up to respond to local contextual needs, while also allowing the United Kingdom to administer its Empire (Hills 2012). The bordering processes that have taken place since the formation of the borders have been ignored by researchers, despite their importance in terms of understanding the current bordering processes in the regions. This section explains that, in opposition to the assumption that subnational borders have limited impact on the lives of those who live adjacent to state borders, the history of the NSW-QLD border shows numerous aspects of border processes that have and, in some cases, continue to impact the citizens.

Following the joint surveying of the border between NSW and QLD in 1863, a border fence was erected from the coast at Point Danger to the Dumaresq River 300km inland. The reason for the fence was for agricultural management to minimise the threat of cattle ticks entering from the new colony of QLD into NSW. Border gates existed along the border, but were most visible at the more densely populated eastern end, where two separate fences were erected with a ‘buffer zone’ in between (Plate 5.1). As each of the colonies maintained their own customs office, there was also a quarantine station, which sprayed all cattle and horses crossing the border including those belonging to local borderlanders (Stuart 2011; Unknown Photographer 1943). The political-administrative bureaucracy was an important driver in the development of the border towns of Coolangatta and Tweed Heads, as has been the case in other frontier towns at international borders (Buursink 2001).

Plate 5.1 Buffer Zone between NSW and QLD (1926)
Despite the citizens of the two towns recognising themselves as citizens of a single town, the borderlanders had to use bridges and gates to cross the border and ‘buffer zone’. The fence was said to be ‘inconvenient and an eyesore’ (Stuart 2011), as can be seen in an image of borderlanders crossing one of the border bridges (Plate 5.2). An illustration of how central the border space was for citizens in the region is the image of a Tweed Farmer selling milk produced in NSW to citizens from Coolangatta, QLD on the border bridge (Plate 5.3).

Plate 5.2 Border Crossing at Coolangatta and Tweed Heads (c. 1910)

While the border fence was initially erected for agricultural management, subsequent events showed that it could have broader impacts. For example, in 1919, it was reported in a New Zealand newspaper that the QLD State Government had closed the border to entry from citizens of NSW, in a similar move to that of NSW closing the border to South Australian and Victorian citizens not long before. The article reported:

The sudden proclamation that pneumonic influenza was at large in New South Wales startled Queensland into prompt and drastic action, and Queensland promptly closed the border against the Mother State (Evening Post 1919: 7).

It was reported that trains were stopped in locations like Tenterfield in Northern NSW and the western NSW border town of Broken Hill. In the case study border region, it was reported:

Closing of the border, suddenly, at noon one day, caused a ludicrous state of affairs. Coolangatta matrons were shopping in Tweed Heads and Tweed Heads men were working in Coolangatta. None were allowed to go home. The bridges over the border fence – a great barbed-wire arrangement – and the fence itself were rigorously guarded. That night and the following nights a part of the population of both places spent its time dodging the guards, crawling under the fences, and generally trying to get home (Evening Post 1919: 7).
This decision had obvious ramifications for the borderlanders in each State, with Coolangatta citizens highly reliant on Tweed Heads for produce. This is reported to have caused borderlanders to have ‘spent their spare time in composing furious letters to the newspaper’ (Evening Post 1919: 7). It was reported in the Sydney Mail (1919b), and illustrated by means of Plate 5.4, that the ‘Residents of Tweed Heads, on the right side of the fence, met those from Coolangatta, on the left side, to discuss the quarantine restrictions and to pass resolutions to be sent to the Premiers of the two States’. This suggests that, at the time, the decision makers had minimal concern for the impact the decision to close the border by the QLD Government would have on the citizens of Coolangatta, let alone the citizens in NSW. This supports the arguments of Martinez (1994a, 1994b, 2005, 2008) that borderlanders will often feel that they are misunderstood by their own State and may decide to make their own decisions at the local scale, including ignoring state laws. It appears that in this case: ‘After a day or two, the guards were apparently got at – for an arrangement was made whereby they turned their backs while essential things like milk were handed over the fence’ (Evening Post 1919: 7). The border re-opened when the threat was considered manageable.
Citizens had easier cross-border access when, in 1924, a motor grid was constructed over the buffer zone that allowed ‘motor traffic to cross at any hour’ (Unknown Photographer 1924) (Plate 5.5). It is thought that the border fence was removed in the Coolangatta-Tweed Heads region in the 1950s (Australian Broadcasting Corporation [ABC] 2010).

Plate 5.5 Motor Grid across the NSW-QLD Border (1924)

Source: Unknown Photographer (1924)

Today, there is only limited historical evidence of the border on the coast, except for a monument and dotted lines that have been cemented into some of the sidewalks (Plate 5.6). At the time of the research, in the western locations of the case study region, the border crossings were still cattle grids and they were signposted showing the differing legislation (see Plate 5.7). This demonstrates the enduring relevance of the border in terms of agricultural management.

Plate 5.6 Border Artefacts in Coolangatta and Tweed Heads (2013)

Source: Developed for this research; Fletcher 2013
Despite a strong interdependency among borderlanders in terms of citizens often working across the border and relying on cross-border trade, the States have treated the region as a frontier zone that needs separation. This was first seen in the determination of a buffer zone and the erection of fencing, but also in the requirements for trade to occur on border bridges. Compassion for borderlanders by their respective States was seen to be at its lowest level when the border was shut by QLD, with no concern shown for borderlanders, giving rise to cross-border meetings and petitions to State Premiers. Even with the removal of many of the fences, border artefacts and signs representing agricultural laws still exist today; they act as everyday reminders that State influence remains and that the interests of borderlanders, who may be hindered by State decisions, are of limited concern.

Plate 5.7 Inland Crossings on the NSW-QLD State Border

Source: Fletcher 2010, 2012
5.3 **Political-administration Messiness of the Borderlands**

Prior to consideration of the connectedness of the border region, general issues in the border region and the case study CBTMEs under study, the following sections outline the environmental context of the border region, the political-administrative structure and tourism destination management context.

5.3.1 **Reflecting Natural Borders: National Parks and Bioregions**

The Central Eastern Rainforest Reserves of Australia [CERRA] were world heritage listed by the Commonwealth of Australia in 1986, but the listing was originally only recorded in NSW. In 1994, parts of QLD were added and, in 2007, the listing was renamed the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia, to denote the ancient species of flora and fauna that characterise the region (from a long time ago). While this collection of rainforests spread between Brisbane and Newcastle ‘cover only about 0.3 per cent of Australia, they contain about half of all Australian plant families and a third of Australia’s mammal and bird species, with the “Border Group” [being] a particularly rich area with the highest concentration of frog, snake, bird and marsupial species in Australia’ (DSEWPC 2008: 1). The “Border Group” is in the centre of the case study border region. The rainforests are managed by the respective State Parks Agencies on each side of the border ‘in collaboration with the federal agency, Environment Australia’ (Mackellar & Derrett 2006: 277), which has since become the Department of the Environment. The parks and nature reserves in the border region are listed in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border Ranges National Park</td>
<td>Burleigh Heads National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goomengerry National Park</td>
<td>David Fleay Wildlife Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpinwood Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Lamington National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mebbin National Park</td>
<td>Main Range National Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Jerusalem National Park</td>
<td>Moogerah Peaks National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Warning National Park</td>
<td>Mount Barney National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightcap National Park</td>
<td>Nerang National Park and Nerang State Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numinbah Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Springbrook National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snows Gully Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Tamborine National Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Edwards (2004); Department of National Parks Recreations Sport and Racing (2012)

---

29 Gondwana is the name given to what was the more southern of two super-continent that are thought to have existed between 510 and 180 million years ago. It was made up of most of what are now the southern hemisphere as well as the Arabian Peninsula and the Indian subcontinent (Meert 2003).
While, at the time of this research, the Federal Government managed six truly national parks, the remaining approximately 9,000 were managed by State Parks Agencies, and called national parks and nature reserves (Tolkach et al. 2016). The national parks and nature reserves on the NSW side of the State border were recognised as a single entity for management processes, having been defined by the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service as being ‘associated with the Tweed shield volcano caldera and located in the hinterland of the Far North Coast of New South Wales’. Despite the caldera being recognised as including adjacent national parks in QLD (Edwards 2004: 7), the region was not recognised or managed as a single natural formation while under study. The north-east corner of NSW has been recognised by the NSW National Parks agency as the ‘South-East Queensland Bioregion’ (see the purple faded section in Figure 5.2), but the region had no links to SEQ and no attempts at collaboration appear to have been made by either State prior to and during the research (NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service 2008: 29).

Figure 5.2 The NSW Coast and Coastal Bioregions

![South East Queensland](image)


In QLD, the national parks in the border region were recognised within a larger QLD national parks plan, with the parks within the border region each recognised as falling within one of two categories, either ‘near Brisbane’ or ‘west of Brisbane’ (Department of National Parks Recreations Sport and Racing 2012). Although many of the parks referred to in Table 5.1 were recognised as forming part of the border-crossing Gondwana Rainforests of Australia by the State National Parks Agencies of NSW and QLD, no attempt has been made to jointly manage the parks.
While, at the time of the research, a unique set of environmental resources were found in the border region, it seems that due to the border location of the resource, it was not being managed as a single entity, but rather as at least two different locations, along state lines. This was true for both environmental management and tourism management.

5.3.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT BORDERS: POLITICAL-ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

In accordance with the division of powers in the Australian Constitution, since establishing constitutions, both States had a legislative, executive and judicial arm with the seat of power established in the respective capital cities of Brisbane and Sydney. The main difference between the structures of the two systems was that QLD was the only State in Australia to have a unicameral parliamentary system, having abolished its Upper House in 1922 (Terry & Giugni 2003). In both State systems, there was a Parliamentary Minister with tourism as part of a broader portfolio, a tourism industry board and an associated tourism agency with the aim of attracting tourists to the respective State. This has been an enduring approach to tourism in each State (Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Jenkins 1993)

Although local governments were not recognised in the Australian Constitution (Acutt 2016; Bell 2006), QLD (Local Government Act 2009) and NSW (Local Government Act 1993) had legislation governing the functioning of the respective local governments. The powers granted to local governments under these acts were:

1. Mandatory powers – these bestowed responsibilities for the ‘provision of basic services, such as waste collection, roads, water and electricity supply’.
2. Permissive powers – ‘those that the local government could opt to undertake in addition to mandatory powers’, including in areas such as economic development and tourism (Dredge & Jenkins 2007: 204-5).

Dredge and Jenkins (2007) explain that, due particularly to its roles and responsibilities in terms of making decisions in such activities as town planning and environmental management, Australian local government is central to tourism destination management strategy. Recently, local governments have been coming under significant pressure; with cost shifting from the State scale to local governments common across most States (Beer 2006; Bell 2006; Dollery & Crase 2004; Dollery & Johnson 2005; Dredge et al. 2011a). This has resulted in State Governments looking to increase efficiencies through reforms and local government amalgamations (Dollery & Crase 2004). These amalgamations have occurred in several States, including NSW and QLD (NSW Government 2016b), and have resulted in changes in the geographical, socio-economic and political characteristics of LGAs and, in turn, the way in
which certain LGAs operate (Techera 2007). As is explained in Section 6.1.2, the Scenic Rim Council was amalgamated in a review of local government in QLD shortly before this research. Within this political-administrative structure, tourism was managed in a similar way in each of the States under analysis, although localised differences reflecting industry and place-based characteristics existed in each LGA.

5.3.3 Tourism Destinations: Borders, Mobility and Perceptions

At the time of writing this thesis, in QLD the statutory authority known as Tourism and Events QLD developed four-year state tourism plans, which were then translated into tourism destination strategies at a regional scale (RTOs) and further focused at the local government scale. In the border region, because of the significance of tourism in the region to the state economy, the Gold Coast was treated as its own RTO and had a DMO supported, in part, by the State Government. The Scenic Rim, however, was included as part of the ‘Brisbane and greater Brisbane’ regional tourism entity, which also included a diverse range of regions including Brisbane city, ‘Moreton Bay and Islands’, to the east of Brisbane, and the ‘Country Valleys’ west of Brisbane and north of the Scenic Rim (Brisbane Marketing 2007: 4). The Scenic Rim (Dredge et al. 2011b) and the Gold Coast (Gold Coast Tourism 2011) each had a Destination Management Plan covering a four-year period, which was linked to the respective RTO and QLD State tourism strategies (EC3 Global 2008, 2012).

Due to the size and importance of the tourism industry to the Gold Coast, as of 2009, the Gold Coast City Council added a further scale of economic and tourism management, by initiating economic development organisations across three precincts. Among them was Connecting South Gold Coast [CSGC], which included the three most southern postcode areas adjacent to the border (including the villages of Rainbow Bay, Coolangatta, Kirra, Bilinga, Tugun,Currumbin, Currumbin Valley and Currumbin Waters) (Southern Gold Coast 2010). In the initial strategic plan for the organisation, one of the key performance indicators was ‘to facilitate environmentally sustainable business growth on an interconnected basis with the wider Gold Coast and Tweed regions’ (Institute of Business Leaders 2009: 10), while also ‘collaborating with Tweed Shire Council’ in ‘Tourism Promotion and Marketing’ (15). In a similar vein, this inter-connectedness of the Southern Gold Coast and the Tweed was recognised as an important tourism asset to the Gold Coast in a report titled Gold Coast and Hinterland Tourism Opportunity Plan: 2009-2018, where Tweed Heads was included as part of the Southern Gold Coast precinct (EC3 Global 2008). However, when the report was updated in September 2012 (EC3 Global 2012), many of the references to locations across the border had

---

30 Similar changes to LGAs have been seen in the de-amalgamations that have occurred in recent years (De Souza, Dollery & Kortt 2015; Drew & Dollery, 2015).
been removed. This indicates the sensitive political nature of cross-border planning, where there is no legal authority to make specific planning provisions, but a need to provide a coordinated approach to future development.

In NSW, Tourism NSW has historically developed State tourism strategies for a four to five-year period (Tourism NSW 2011). Numerous authors have recognised that many of these objectives and strategies have centred on Sydney as a global city and as an entry point to the State for travellers, including those travelling to more peripheral areas of the State, such as the Northern Rivers (Enright & Roberts 2001; Jenkins 1993; National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008; Roberts & Enright 2004). In common with QLD, these strategies were translated into RTO strategies. The border region was included in the Northern Rivers regional tourism entity up until 2013, when the RTO was amalgamated with the Mid-North Coast RTO, forming the North Coast Destination Network. The amalgamated network included the coastal region between the QLD border and the Great Lakes, a region approximately 600km south (the North Coast Destination Network 2013). The network published a planning document in 2013, making no reference to cross-border tourism efforts, beyond capitalising on Gold Coast Airport (North Coast Destination Network 2013).

At the local government scale, where resourcing allowed for it and when seen as a priority, each council had a local tourism organisation or a department/position within the council to manage tourism. In the Tweed Shire, an economic development and tourism organisation was employed while this research was taking place. The organisation had provided an action plan, vision statement and mission statement on their website (Destination Tweed 2011). In NSW, the planning process was relaxed, with one government document suggesting that ‘in planning for tourism needs, councils will have regard’ to the relevant regional plans (Department of Planning 2006: 37). The Tweed plan made no reference to the RTO or State strategies; nor did it include any reference to any locations or entities across the border.

Not for the first time, in 2008, O’Neill (2008) advised the NSW Government, following a review into tourism in the State, to allow local governments to collaborate with one another and with their counterparts in other States. Following inaction on these recommendations, in 2010, a further State Government commissioned report found that tourism managers in the State required more flexibility in terms of collaboration with other LGAs. It was recommended that LGA tourism managers have the freedom to work with other LGAs, including those across State borders, rather than being limited only to entities included in State Government regional tourism areas (Tourism NSW 2010). Again, no action or commitment from the State Government resulted from this advice.
5.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter aimed to be the first step in critically examining the South-east QLD and Northern Rivers, NSW subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for CBTM. It aimed to critically examine the historical formation of the border and the boundaries that exist within the region. In doing so, the chapter contributed the most in-depth historical analysis of an Australia border, and began the process of bridging the knowledge gap in terms of the bordering processes in an Australian subnational border region. During the analysis, five key observations were made.

Firstly, the analysis confirmed that borders are messy and culturally constructed. It was proposed in Chapter 3 that, following the arguments of Law (2004, 2007), border regions are messy spaces and CBTM is a wicked problem. These contentions have been supported in this chapter, with the finding that the state border central to the case study was formed through a highly contested, social process. Furthermore, since the formation of the border, the liminal space has been characterised as being socially complex, and involving multiple perspectives and interdependences.

Secondly, the subnational borders are much messier than has been recognised in the literature and are in significantly more need of research attention. It was posited in Chapter 3 that subnational border regions might have received such little research attention, particularly in comparison to international border regions, because they are thought to have limited barrier effects and hold limited messiness. The findings in the chapter, however, support the arguments of Timothy (2001) and Newman and Paasi (1998) that subnational border regions can be just as messy as international border regions, particularly at state scale borders. These border processes, while felt most readily at the local and micro scales, were clearly conditioned by a range of actors both within and outside of the region, ‘with scale-crossing complexity’ (Paasi 2010: 2297).

Thirdly, functional boundaries can be different from social borders. While there are simplified perspectives on borders that assume that functional (or political-administration) borders align with social boundaries, this research has shown that it is important to understand that the situation is more nuanced than this. The mere fact that, for a state agency, boundaries are at a certain location does not mean that tourists and tourism managers readily identify with and observe these boundaries. This supports the argument that borders can be viewed from a ‘multiplicity of (sometimes contradictory) perspectives’ (Rumford 2012: 894).
Fourthly, political-administrative borders are constantly changing due to political decisions and public policies. The way in which a certain government or agency views their role and gives meaning to borders impacts the way in which borderlanders interact and affects their cross-border capability. This is particularly true at the state scale, but also at the federal scale, with certain policies and programs being focused on different regions and having different boundaries. This supports the argument that border regions are negotiated spaces, which are influenced not only by actors within the region, but also by actors at higher scales and those who are not located within proximity to a border region (Herzog & Sohn 2014; Paasi 2010; Zimmerbauer 2011).

Finally, multiple spatial boundaries can coexist. As Paasi (2009, 2010) argues, both functional and social borders are in a constant state of flux. Social boundaries change with changes in identity, promotional approaches and tourism demand. Functional boundaries change with changes in the political environment and depending on the policy issues being addressed. Just as different governments and actors make political and policy decisions that have differing boundaries over time, multiple different actors and agencies may have different boundaries for their policies at the same time. The complexity of the situation was emphasised by highlighting the fact that tourism managers in border regions need to negotiate and respond to agencies and programs in a liminal space where existing political structures and sets of scales meet (Timothy 2001; Timothy & Teye 2004). The following chapter investigates this issue in further depth, by analysing the local government areas central to the case study and their interaction at the time of the study.
6 Unpacking Messiness: The Central East Coast Border Region

This chapter takes a closer look at the local government areas [LGAs] investigated in this thesis, located adjacent to the border and at the centre of the tourism management episodes that are the units of analysis for this study. The chapter is the second of three which aims to critically examine the South-east Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for CBTM (Research Objective 3). It begins by analysing the key characteristics of each LGA. This is followed by consideration of the interdependencies between the border region LGAs, as well as the issues that face borderlanders because of proximity to the state border. The final section explores two initiatives, by governments at higher scales, to address border issues. The following chapter then considers the context of the CBTMEs central to the opportunities and challenges presented in later chapters.

6.1 Case Study Local Government Areas

An overview of the border region context was provided in Chapter 5. The following sections deal explicitly with the three LGAs that are the focus of this thesis. These LGAs were justified for inclusion in Chapter 4 and are the regions from which most of the local actors were selected; being a central region to the CBTMEs detailed in Chapter 7.

6.1.1 City of Gold Coast (QLD)

The Gold Coast has been considered ‘one of Australia’s most iconic destinations’ (Dredge & Jamal 2013). Along with the capital Brisbane, it forms part of a larger conurbation known as South-East Queensland [SEQ] (QLD Department of Infrastructure and Planning 2009). At the time of this research, the Gold Coast was the sixth largest city in Australia (Dredge & Jamal 2013), with 555 608 residents in 2015 and the population having grown at an annual rate of 1.8% (ABS 2016a). With a regional area of 1331.7km², the City of the Gold Coast (QLD) was about the same geographic size as Tweed Shire (NSW) and less than a third of the geographic size of the Scenic Rim Regional Council Area (QLD), while the population density in 2015 was recorded at 417.2 people/km² (ABS 2016a).

The gross regional product (GRP) of the City of the Gold Coast in the most recent data available was $26.89 billion, which had decreased from the previous year (.id 2016a). How much of this is due to the tourism industry and tourism activity is difficult to ascertain, as the very notions of the tourism industry and tourism activity resist definition (Leiper 1979, 2004, 2008;
Smith 1994, 1998a, 1998b). Tourism Research Australia [TRA] (2011a: 10) has noted that the Gold Coast not only has a large tourism industry, but that the region has historically been ‘highly dependent on tourism’. As shown in Table 6.1, the most recent data indicate that retail trade was the biggest employer (13.3%), while the accommodation and food services sector was the fourth largest employer in the region (at 9.7%). Considering the importance of shopping as a reason for visitors to travel to the Gold Coast (Tourism and Events Queensland 2013a), tourists, too, would be expected to be contributing significantly to this sector.

Table 6.1 Top Six Employing Industries on the Gold Coast (End of June 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage of Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from .id (2013a)

The annual average visitation between 2009 and 2012 was 9.67 million, with an annual spend of $4,227 million. As can be seen in Table 6.2, day-trippers made up over half of all visitors, but had the lowest average spend and contributed the least income to the region. The largest overall spend for the region, during the research period, was from domestic overnight visitors, who contributed just over 65% of the region’s tourism income, while making up just under a third of visitor numbers. Both day-trippers and domestic overnight tourists visited the Gold Coast for the same main reasons: to eat out at restaurants, go to the beach, shop for pleasure, visit friends and relatives, and also for general sightseeing. International tourists stayed longer, spent the most per night and made up the smallest number of visitors. Over this time, international markets were made up primarily of visitors from Asia, New Zealand and Continental Europe.

The Gold Coast offered 151 hotels, motels and other accommodation and a total of 13,500 rooms (Gold Coast Exhibition and Convention Centre 2016)\(^3\), as well as 56,000 rooms in 989 serviced apartments. These establishments were most prominently clustered around Broadbeach, Coolangatta, Main Beach and Surfers Paradise (ABS 2013c). The Gold Coast also boasted the ‘largest concentration of themed attractions in the southern hemisphere’ (Gold Coast Exhibition and Convention Centre 2016). It has been defined as a multi-nodal linear destination (Russell & Faulkner 2004). In other words, the region includes several nodes

\(^3\) This information can only be used indicatively as establishments with less than 15 rooms are not included in the statistics; it would be expected that this is an important component of the sector for all regions under study. It particularly effects any consideration of the Scenic Rim and the Tweed Shire, as guesthouses and boutique establishments, which are common in these areas, are not included.
that are destinations in their own right. According to Dredge and Jamal (2013), based on a breakdown of tourism statistics, each node has its own character and attracts different types of tourists with different motivations. It has been said that the southern end, directly beside the state border, tends to ‘attract domestic (predominantly intrastate) markets’ and is ‘characterised by older accommodation stock in various stages of decline and renewal’ (Dredge & Jamal 2013: 7).

Table 6.2 Gold Coast Tourism Visitor Profile (Annual Average 2009-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors (overnight and daytrips)</td>
<td>9,666,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>20,653,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend</td>
<td>$4,227 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Overnight Travel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>3,142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>13,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average stay (nights)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spend</td>
<td>$2,774 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per visitor per stay</td>
<td>$883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per night</td>
<td>$211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 activities (in order)</td>
<td>Eat out at restaurants, go to the beach, shop for pleasure, visit friends and relatives, general sightseeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Day Trip</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>5,765,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spend</td>
<td>$588 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per visitor per trip</td>
<td>$102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 activities (in order)</td>
<td>Eat out at restaurants, visit friends and relatives, go to the beach, go shopping, general sightseeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Overnight Travel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>759,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>7,523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average stay (nights)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spend</td>
<td>$865 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per visitor per stay</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per night</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 Areas of Origin (in order)</td>
<td>Asia, New Zealand, Continental Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Tourism and Events Queensland (2013a)
6.1.2 Scenic Rim Regional Council (QLD)

In 2007, the QLD Government commissioned a review of the boundaries of the LGAs across the State, with the aim of increasing efficiencies and overcoming challenges (Local Government Reform Commission 2007a). This process had important implications for the regions that were amalgamated to form the Scenic Rim Regional Council. Because of the amalgamation, the northern parts of the existing Beaudesert Shire were merged into the LGA to the north and the southern part amalgamated with Boonah Shire and Harrisville, which was previously part of Ipswich City Council. The justification for this decision was that the amalgamation aimed to combine areas with the common characteristic of being rural, and separate the LGA from the urban regions to the north (Local Government Reform Commission 2007b). As the State’s tourism agencies did not reform, the Scenic Rim remained within the Brisbane Marketing RTO, which included Brisbane and other urban regions to the north.

In the first census since the amalgamation, the LGA was recorded as having a population of 39,757, having seen a growth of 0.8% from 2014 to 2015. Given the region’s area of 4248.1km² and its relatively small population, the population density of the region (9.4 people/km²) is in significant contrast to that of the urban Gold Coast (ABS 2016a). This is related to the importance of the agricultural and the equine sectors as the region’s biggest employer (see Table 6.3). With an overall GRP of $1.4 billion, tourism was growing in importance at the time of the research, with accommodation and food services contributing to 8.9% of the employment in the region (Sustainable Scenic Rim 2012). As was explained by the Local Government Reform Commission (2007b), agro-ecotourism was strengthening across much of the LGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage of Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration and Safety</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Sustainable Scenic Rim (2012)

Due to the amalgamation of the region in 2008, local historical data on tourism in the region was very difficult to source. Tourist spending figures had not been published since the region had been amalgamated, while the data that was distributed had been modelled off national data and was therefore seen not to be particularly reliable. Based on the information available, direct expenditure for the previous, smaller Beaudesert LGA was estimated to total $122 million in the
most recent data available at the time of the research (Dredge et al. 2011b). As is presented in Table 6.4, there were just over one million visitors to the Scenic Rim annually from 2009 to 2012. Most of these visitors were domestic day-trippers (77.2%), with domestic overnight visitors making up most of the other visitor types (21.6%). International visitors made up less than two percent of the visitors to the region.

Table 6.4 Scenic Rim Tourism Visitor Profile (Annual Average 2009-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors (overnight and daytrips)</td>
<td>1 020 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>635 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spend</td>
<td>$122 million*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Overnight Travel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>220 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>522 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average stay (nights)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spend</td>
<td>$55 million*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 activities (in order)</td>
<td>Bushwalking or rainforest walks, visit friends or relatives, eat out at restaurants, general sightseeing, visit national parks or state parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Day Trip</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>787 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spend</td>
<td>$57 million*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 activities (in order)</td>
<td>Eat out at restaurants, general sightseeing, visit friends or relatives, bushwalking or rainforest walks, visit national parks or state parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Overnight Travel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>13 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>113 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average stay (nights)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spend</td>
<td>$10 million*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 4 Areas of Origin (in order)</td>
<td>Continental Europe, New Zealand, United Kingdom, Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Dredge et al. (2011b); Tourism and Events Queensland (2013b)

Note: Figures marked with an * indicate older data collected within the previous LGA of Beaudesert Council

In contrast to the Gold Coast, the most popular activities for visitors to the region were directed towards natural attractions including bush walking, sightseeing and visiting national parks. The size of the domestic day-trippers market can be explained in part by the closeness of the region to urban areas such as Brisbane and the Gold Coast (Dredge et al. 2011b). It may also be due to a limitation, in terms of the amount of accommodation available, making overnight stays less convenient. In the latest tourism research data, the Scenic Rim was thought to contain only eight establishments and 206 rooms (ABS 2013c). This is misleading, however, as Mount Tamborine and Canungra (both regions within the Scenic Rim) were recorded as being
within the Gold Coast, so it is likely that other establishments have been missed. A count of the establishments available for booking on the website *Scenic Rim Escapes* (2016) suggested there were at least 20 establishments in the region clustered around Mount Tamborine, the main townships of Beaudesert and Boonah, as well on the edge of some of the national parks near the border. Many of these were ecotourism and nature-based.

### 6.1.3 Tweed Shire (NSW)

After Sydney, the North Coast region was the most visited area of NSW, and was continuing to grow at the time of the research (Destination NSW 2014). In the same way that the Gold Coast has been considered an important tourism destination in QLD, the Tweed region has been a particularly important tourism destination for NSW. As a region, the population at the last census was 92,460 citizens; it had grown at a rate of 1.4% from 2014 to 2015 (ABS 2016a). As was the case of the Scenic Rim (Dredge *et al.* 2011b), this number was expected to continue to grow, with an increasing number of older citizens and a decline in the number of younger citizens (Department of Planning 2006). Despite having a similar regional area as the Gold Coast, at 1307.4km$^2$, the population density was considerably lower with 70.7 people/km$^2$ (ABS 2013a). This indicates the region had significantly more agricultural and uninhabited land than the Gold Coast, but was still more built-up, at least in parts, than the Scenic Rim.

The GRP of the region was last recorded to be $2.89 billion, fluctuating over the past ten years (.id 2016b; Feliu 2011). As can be seen in Table 6.5, health care and social assistance (16.5%) was the largest employer in the region. Much like the Gold Coast, retail trade (15.2%) and accommodation and food services (9.5%) were the most important sectors at the time of the research. This point has been made by TRA (2011a: 10) in the comment that the Tweed not only has a large tourism industry, but has historically been ‘highly dependent on tourism’. The importance of retail in terms of tourism was reflected in the main activities for tourists in the region, with shopping for pleasure important to day-trippers and domestic overnight visitors (Destination NSW 2012a). An important point regarding this activity was the perception held of the region by tourists – it remains unknown whether the activities reported occur within the LGA or elsewhere. For instance, it is entirely possible that many of the tourists who stayed in Tweed did much of their shopping on the Gold Coast and visitors to the Gold Coast primarily engaged in sightseeing in the Tweed Shire or in the Scenic Rim.

Visitation to the Tweed was recorded at an annual average over the four years to September 2011 of 1.38 million, with an annual spend of $321 million (Destination NSW 2012b). Table 6.6 shows that, of the visitors to the region, more than half (64%) were day-trippers, while domestic overnight visitors made up 27% of visitors to the region. Of the domestic overnight visitors, more than half (54.7%) were from QLD (Destination NSW 2012b),...
indicating the important link between the State as a tourist generating region and the Tweed region as a destination. Despite being adjacent to the Gold Coast International airport, international visitation to the region was limited. In terms of spending, domestic overnight visitors made up the biggest proportion (67.6%), despite only representing a quarter of visitors, while day-trippers contributed 27.1% of the average annual spend. The top five activities of domestic visitors in the region mirrored those noted for the Gold Coast, including eating at restaurants, going to the beach, visiting friends and relatives, sightseeing and shopping. The international visitors to the region mainly came from New Zealand, UK, USA, Germany and Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage of Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration and Safety</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from .id (2013b)

On the supply side, the latest available statistics at the time of the research suggested that the area contained 23 accommodation providers in the LGA, offering 1290 rooms (ABS 2013b)\(^{32}\). More broadly, ‘close to 2000 individual businesses’ were said to operate in the tourism sector within the region (Tweed Business 2012), with most clustered directly next to the border in Tweed Heads, along the Tweed Coast and in the inland town of Murwillumbah (ABS 2013b). Despite the importance of tourism to the region and the top five activities for tourists having minimal nature-based tourism aspects (except for general sightseeing), the regional plan for Northern NSW cautioned too much tourism development might impact the destination’s appeal:

This highlights the need to ensure that the character and appeal of coastal towns, villages and their hinterland, which are drawcards for visitors, is not lost through inappropriate development (Department of Planning 2006: 8).

This point, made by a NSW Government agency, was also captured by Cr Joan van Lieshout, who expressed that locals have a very clear vision for the Tweed: ‘we have a vision for the Tweed and we want to make it quite distinct from the Gold Coast’, implying that there was concern that tourism was becoming too much of the focus in Tweed and showing concern for the impact this could have on the LGA (Simpson 2011: 2).

---

\(^{32}\) The same issues must be noted as for the data on the LGAs in Queensland, including that establishments with less than 15 rooms were not counted.
### Table 6.6 Tweed Tourism Visitor Profile (Annual Average 2008-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors (overnight and daytrips)</td>
<td>1 376 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>1 941 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spend</td>
<td>$321 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Overnight Travel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>470 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>1 689 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average stay (nights)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spend</td>
<td>$217 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per visitor per stay</td>
<td>$461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per night</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 activities (in order)</td>
<td>Eat out at restaurants, go to the beach, visit friends or relatives, general sightseeing, shop for pleasure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Day Trip</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>886 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spend</td>
<td>$87 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per visitor per trip</td>
<td>$98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 activities (in order)</td>
<td>Eat out at restaurants, visit friends or relatives, go to the beach, shop for pleasure, general sightseeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Overnight Travel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>21 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nights</td>
<td>252 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average stay (nights)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spend</td>
<td>$17 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per visitor per stay</td>
<td>$835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend per night</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 Areas of Origin (in order)</td>
<td>New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States of America, Germany, Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Destination NSW (2012a)

The lack and/or out-dated nature of local tourism data available in the border region shows the data inadequacies that the actors have had to contend with in planning and managing tourism in the area. Where data is available, the differing types and release dates between States make it difficult to establish comparisons. Decisions such as what, when and how data is collected is determined by higher government scales at different points of time. The data inadequacies that have been found imply that agencies at these higher scales see the border region as holding limited importance. This only causes further discontent among borderlanders, who see the decisions that are made as an impediment to growth. Furthermore, the data that has been collected and modelled by the higher scales provides no insights in terms of establishing the size of cross-border tourism traffic, nor does it attempt to assist in the planning and development of
cross-border tourism. Not to mention that insufficient data impacts the business cases that can be made in seeking funding from higher scales.

This lack of information compounds the difficulty that borderlanders have in gaining support for their projects from higher scales, as they are unable to support the importance of cross-border tourism with repudiable evidence. The OECD (2013: 47) argues the importance of identifying and analysing functional regions in the cross-border development process, but acknowledges that, in most cases, ‘such data are often not generated or analysed’. According to this source, Australia’s border regions are similar to other border regions of the world in this regard.

6.2 COEXISTENCE AND COMPLEXITY: THE MANY MEANINGS OF BORDERS

Given the significance of day-trippers to the three LGAs within the border region, it could be assumed there was a strong level of border-crossing tourism traffic in the region. This may include tourists staying in one LGA and taking day trips to the others. It is impossible to conclude whether this has indeed been the case, due to the deficiency in the available tourist visitation figures, which only reflected the original tourism-generating region (home) a tourist came from. Anecdotal evidence suggested that cross-border tourist traffic was high (e.g. Participant 4, DMO CEO; Participant 5, DMO CEO).

The urbanised part of the case study border region has had a high population growth rate. Analysis has shown the coastal part of the NSW-QLD border region has not been alone in this, as some of Australia’s ‘fastest-growing centres lie close to state boundaries, such as the Tweed Heads-Coolangatta region, Albury-Wodonga and Queanbeyan-Canberra’ (Neales 2012: 2). This finding strengthens the importance of studies of subnational border regions, such as the analysis in this thesis. In addition to this, the Scenic Rim has also been undergoing significant population growth, as has much of SEQ (ABS 2013a; SGS Economics and Planning 2005). This means that the border region faced similar issues and challenges at the time of the research, resulting from such levels of growth, requiring significant joint decision making among governments.

Unfortunately, joint decision making in the border region has been limited. One example of this was a real estate development located in NSW, but accessed via QLD, that had been in the planning process for numerous years. The Cobaki Lakes development was first considered by the relevant agencies on both sides of the border in 2001 (Cardno Eppel Olsen 2008; NSW Department of Information Technology and Management/QLD Department of Natural Resources and Mines 2001). In this instance, it was a necessity for the regions to interact, with

---

33 These are ‘geographic areas defined by their economic and social integration rather than by traditional administrative boundaries. A functional region is a self-contained economic unit according to the functional criteria chosen (for example, commuting, water service or a school district)’ (OECD 2016: 11).
the new development being within the jurisdiction of the NSW Department of Planning, but having an expected impact on QLD roads, infrastructure and schools, which were already at capacity (NSW Cross-Border Commissioner 2013). Similar concerns existed in terms of the planning of tourism developments close to the border. An example of the inter-connectedness of the border region and the failure to effectively jointly manage border issues was the dredging of the Tweed River in NSW, which resulted in the world-famous Kirra Beach surf break in QLD degrading, having a direct influence on the attractiveness of the beach for surf tourism (ABC News 2009).

According to Herzog (2014: 396), ‘workers represent a significant segment in the daily life of border regions’. The coastal section of the border region has a particularly integrated workforce, with citizens from the Tweed Shire and the Gold Coast crossing the border to travel to their place of employment. In the 2001 census, it was found that ‘a large share of Northern Rivers residents’ journey to work trips were made north over the border to the Gold Coast’. In the Tweed Shire, ‘22% of all workplace destinations are in SEQ, suggesting a growing “dormitory suburb” status for Tweed and surrounding North Coast LGAs’ (SGS Economics and Planning 2005: 6). In the 2011 census, this pattern continued with the Tweed Shire being the largest source of workers from outside the Gold Coast, even ahead of other LGAs within QLD. A relatively small proportion of the Gold Coast population (4342 people) travelled south to other parts of NSW to work, while Scenic Rim citizens were most likely to work in Brisbane, if they travelled outside of the LGA for work. As an indication of the importance of Tweed workers to SEQ, more than half (60.2%) of all workers travelling from NSW to the State of QLD for work resided in Tweed (QLD Treasury and Trade 2012). This shows that there has been significant mobility across the political border, with many Tweed citizens, including those working in tourism, working in QLD.

At the same time, it had been emphasised, when this research was being carried out, that the Northern Rivers area ‘is increasingly used by South-East Queensland residents for recreational activities, daytrips and short stays. This has a significant and growing impact in terms of both the provisions and use of state and local infrastructure, particularly in the coastal areas of Tweed and Byron Bay’ (Department of Planning 2006: 8). Furthermore, in terms of infrastructure, the QLD Government had recognised the shortage of industrial land throughout much of SEQ (QLD Department of Infrastructure and Planning 2009), and the Tweed Shire had signalled this as a potential community and economic development opportunity (SGS Economics and Planning 2005).
Considering the number of citizens who had been found to travel across the border, for both work and tourism, it is no surprise that borderlanders have put pressure on their respective State Governments for further integration of transport across the border region. While many of the towns – including Beaudesert and Mount Tamborine in QLD, and most of the towns in the Northern Rivers – originally had rail lines, these have since been disbanded by the respective State Governments. In the more densely populated areas such as the Tweed Coast and the Gold Coast, there has been a significant push for a joint cross-border rail line (Cross Border Transport Taskforce 2009). A testament to the importance of such a cross-border rail line was seen in a proposal for the Gold Coast’s Light Rail systems to be extended to the Southern Gold Coast and then across the border to the Tweed. It has been recognised that, were this to happen, it would likely not be until after 2020 (Southern Gold Coast Light Rail Working Group 2010). The success of such a plan, while of clear benefit to the borderlanders who cross the border daily, will depend primarily on decisions made by the respective State Governments. In spite of the inter-connectedness of the borderlanders in the region, they still face challenges that result primarily from the State Government priorities that begin in each State capital and end at the border.

6.2.1 ISSUES IN THE BORDER REGION

Border issues are regularly recognised in the local press in border regions across Australia. Examples of issues recognised in the local and national media from 2008 to 2012 and pertaining to the QLD/NSW border region are presented in Table 6.7. Consideration of the issues reported soon revealed that many of the constraints and issues that have been found to exist in border regions are less a result of local conditions, but rather the interaction of local conditions and decisions made at higher scales (Chen 2005; Paasi 2009, 2010; Zimmerbauer 2011). In this case, the most influential scale was the State, which implemented regulations on whether daylight saving was observed and, if so, for how long; the dates when school terms occur; the operation of the parallel health systems; major public works; the law enforcement system; and regulation on businesses. The Federal Government and NSW Government have both attempted to assist in remedying border issues in the border regions, as discussed hereafter.

34 Examples include issues in Mungindi, NSW, Boggabilla, NSW (Moree Champion 2012) and Goondiwindi, QLD (Evening Post 1919); in Albury, NSW and Wodonga, Victoria (Worrall 2012); in Queanbeyan, NSW and the Australian Capital Territory (Kretowicz 2012); as well as in small communities like Bonshaw, NSW, Mingoola, QLD, Yetman, NSW, Jennings, NSW and Wallangarra, QLD (ABC News 2011).

35 Main roads are also a State responsibility, with perspectives on cross-border main roads sometimes at odds (e.g. Transport and Infrastructure Council 2014).
6.2.1.1 **A Federal Response: Regulation Reduction Incentive Fund**

The Federal Government aided the border region to overcome issues resulting from the location of a state border within the region. This was the result of a Liberal Party commitment in the 2004 election to minimise regulation on businesses. The *Regulation Reduction Incentive Fund* (RRIF) allowed local councils across Australia to bid for their project to be supported by a portion of the $50 million available in the fund (Allison 2008). Eligibility for funding was determined by the extent to which each project would minimise regulatory and compliance costs and effort for small businesses, with concern for home-based businesses (Local Government Association of South Australia 2005), of which tourism businesses are a significant part (TRA 2013).

During 2005, ‘the Gold Coast City Council’s Economic Development Branch, the Gold Coast’s Regional Economic Development Advisory Board, Tweed Shire, Tweed Economic Development Corporation and Southern Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce formed a cross-border working party to discuss the regulatory compliance burden faced by small businesses in the region, ‘especially those operating on both sides of the border’ (Gold Coast Business 2009b). One outcome of this working party was a submission to the RRIF titled * Seamless Borders – Building Competitive Economic Zone for the Gold Coast and Tweed Region* (Gold Coast Business 2009b). The submission evidenced existing regional identities, with only the Gold Coast and Tweed actors involved in the project, but also supported the claim that
urbanised border regions face a heightened level of issues (Buursink 2001). The aims of the project were to:

- Investigate and prioritise the range of issues identified in the application.
- Develop strategies to align local regulatory compliance.
- Implement initiatives for alignment on both sides of the border.
- Develop a single entry point for information on how to apply for and comply with registrations and licensing.
- Undertake discussions to address state issues.
- Implement initiatives to address differences in state regulation.
- Implement a marketing strategy ensuring awareness of the new processes (Gold Coast Business 2009b).

Although the RRIF was not explicitly aimed at supporting border regions, the location of a state border within the region was a major regulatory burden, resulting in the project being deemed eligible. By successfully winning the grant, Gold Coast City Council and the Tweed Shire Council received $570 000 from the Federal Government, which resulted in a total budget of $700 000, following contributions from each of the local councils (Gold Coast City Council 2007). Despite many of the regulatory issues in the border region being a result of State decision making and laws, resulting from Australia’s constitution (Dredge & Jenkins 2007), no funding or support of any kind came from either the QLD Government or the NSW Government.

It was reported in the minutes of a Gold Coast City Council (2007) meeting that the project had resulted in a ‘toolbox’ for use in minimising regulatory compliance issues in other Australian border regions, that a ‘one-stop shop’ had been established in the form of a website, including links to the respective State Governments to lobby for the mitigation of border issues, where small businesses could access information about carrying out business in the border region, as well as a set of DVDs to guide small businesses on how to ‘apply and comply’. During the time of this research, the Seamless Borders website began as a portal that consisted primarily of dead links and was eventually taken down completely in 2010. No copies of the DVDs could be found and no changes appeared to have occurred at the other border regions in Australia because of the project. Although this was a worthy initiative, which acknowledged the rarely acknowledged issues that exist within the border region, the project became one of assisting borderlanders with compliance and did not result in any remedies to the issues or structural tensions that existed.
6.2.1.2 A State Response: New South Wales Cross-border Commissioner

In recognition of the influence of the State on border regions in 2011, Richard Torbay, the NSW State Member for the borderland electorate of the Northern Tablelands, re-introduced a Bill in the NSW Parliament to establish a Cross-Border Commission in NSW. He made it clear that the Bill had already been introduced by another Minister in 2000 and 2005, around the same time that the Federal Liberal Party committed to establish the RRIF, explaining that ‘it was a good Bill then and it is a good Bill now. The reason I have chosen to reintroduce this Bill is that this is a critically important issue for those border communities; it is a problem that has not gone away’ (Legislation Review Committee 2011: 804). In his speech to the NSW Parliament, the Minister detailed the issues faced by many borderlanders on the fringes of the State and he acknowledged the nodding from other Ministers from other NSW borderland electorates (Legislation Review Committee 2011). These points are reminiscent of the argument made two decades earlier by House (1980: 463), that border regions ‘have special problems and merit specific policies, the more so if those problems are likely to grow worse with public inaction’.

The NSW Parliament passed the Bill (Cross-Border Commission Bill 2011) in 2011 (Cross-Border Commission Act 2011). It allowed for a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to be signed with the State of QLD (no such agreements were made between other States or Territories) and a NSW Cross-Border Commissioner to be appointed. The MOU between the States was signed on 30 August 2011 (QLD Government/NSW Government 2011). In 2012, the Commissioner reported in a “Listening Tour Report” that ‘16 key cross-border issue categories’ were found to exist in the State’s border regions (NSW Trade & Investment 2012: 8), closely reflecting the issues reported in the media (see Table 6.7, on page 122). Among the issues were concerns around tourism and regional cross-border planning (Selin 1993). At the time of the research, the detail in the report was limited and no legislative outcomes had been reported based on the findings of the Commissioner (NSW Cross-Border Commissioner 2013). The role of the Commissioner has been more one of advocacy, rather than actioning change (NSW Cross-Border Commissioner 2015).

The process has reinforced the differences in perspectives and priorities of the States (Nicholls 2014) and the difficulties that a single actor has in attempting to deal with cross-border issues, irrespective of the authority they hold in one State (Cartwright 2014; Lovejoy 2014). The initiative also shows that initiatives in one State do not necessarily translate into actions in other States and Territories\(^\text{36}\).

\(^{36}\) The Australian Capital Territory Government has outright dismissed the establishment of a Cross-border Commissioner role in its region (Kretowicz 2012), despite being located entirely within the State of NSW.
6.3 CONCLUSION

This chapter aimed to critically examine the South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for CBTM (Research Objective 3). It analysed three adjacent local governments located in a border region. It found that subnational border regions can be highly diverse spaces, involving scale-crossing complexity. Five main findings have been made in this chapter.

Firstly, regions located beside one another do not necessarily share strong similarities, having differing capacities and interest in developing tourism. This chapter has highlighted that adjacent local governments can be significantly different. It was evident there were distinct urban, rural and peri-urban spaces across the three LGAs. This means that adjacent regions may offer very different tourism experiences and attract different tourism markets, as well as have significantly different capacities and interest in developing tourism. Wang et al. (2013) found that adjacent counties in Central Florida also differed in their tourism offerings, seeing this as an opportunity for the regions to diversify their product. Such a view is limited in that these differences can also lead to challenges, such as regional identities and othering, which can limit collaboration.

Secondly, adjacent regions, while being different, can share opportunities due to their proximity. Two or more regions may have very limited interaction or characteristics in common, but they can, nevertheless, be faced with a similar environment. It has been highlighted that adjacent regions can share unique assets, such as geological formations and natural ecosystems, with significant tourism potential. Such assets may be considerably larger than local government regions and may span multiple political-administrative borders. Despite sharing these opportunities, functional boundaries can significantly impact the way and extent to which they are capitalised.

Thirdly, proximity to a state border has implications for those who reside in the region and, at the same time, impacts the management of tourism. Extending on a key finding in Chapter 5 that subnational border regions can be messy, this chapter has shown that subnational borders do influence activity in adjacent regions. While noting that border regions are heterogeneous, this research has confirmed that ‘economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity’ (Hansen 1981: 19) to a state border. Issues can range from different time zones to poorly coordinated planning. Border issues can also directly and significantly affect the way that tourism managers operate in a border region, an example of this being limitations regarding the amount and quality of tourism data available for decision making.
Fourthly, actors at higher scales can have an awareness of border issues in border regions. Numerous researchers have claimed that actors, and particularly governments, may have limited interest in and concern for issues that exist in international border regions (Buursink 2001; Herzog 1990, 1991, 2014; Herzog & Sohn 2014; Martinez 1994b). This chapter has put this into question with respect to subnational border regions, providing evidence of initiatives that show governments acknowledging issues in border regions. However, in at least one case, this recognition was a result of a long negotiation process by borderlanders, particularly elected officials in State Parliament.

Finally, while attempts by actors at higher scales may be made to overcome barriers, they are piecemeal and have limited impact. In addition to recognising border issues in the border region, the Federal Government and NSW Government introduced initiatives aimed at overcoming issues created by the state border. It was found, however, that both initiatives, to use the language of Paasi (2002b), were more “initiatives on paper” than “initiatives in practice”. While higher scale governments do have some level of responsibility for assisting regions within their jurisdictions, assistance in the case of subnational border regions can be piecemeal and not substantial enough to have any lasting impact on what is a highly wicked problem. While higher scales may attempt to assist subnational border regions to overcome border issues, at the same time it is the very same scales that are generally creating many of the issues. Shared border issues can provide adjacent regions with common ground to work collaboratively. The following chapter deals precisely with this issue, by analysing the CBTMEs central to this thesis.
7 THREE AUSTRALIAN CROSS-BORDER TOURISM MANAGEMENT EPISODES

This chapter is the link between the case study border region context that has been the focus of Chapters 5 and 6, and the following chapters that synthesise and evaluate the opportunities and challenges for tourism management in border regions. Hence, it is the third and final chapter that aims to critically examine the South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for CBTM (Research Objective 3). Specifically, this chapter sets the scene for discussing the opportunities and challenges to CBTM in the case study border region, by critically examining the narratives of the three CBTMEs studied.

7.1 OVERVIEW OF THE CASE STUDY EPISODES

Table 7.1 provides an overview of the CBTMEs studied in this thesis. It provides an overview of the region that each CBTME covered, the primary driver and the stated aims of the CBTM activity. The table also presents the state of each CBTME to an outside observer, at the time of writing this thesis, noting that certain efforts may have been underway that were not publicly available and that different actors held different perspectives on the state of the work. Finally, it notes the main source of funding for each episode.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBTME</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Primary Driver</th>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rainforest Way [RW]</td>
<td>QLD: Boonah &amp; Beaudesert (now Scenic Rim), Gold Coast NSW: Kyogle, Richmond Valley, Lismore, Tweed</td>
<td>Grass-roots project by numerous inland local councils Response to ecotourism emphasis in State Tourism Plans and Northern Rivers NSW Far North Coast Ecotourism Plan</td>
<td>Attract domestic tourists to the broader inland region Spread tourism benefit throughout inland region Showcase the Central Eastern Rainforest Reserves of Australia [CERRA]</td>
<td>Poorly maintained website and roadside signage No board or Project Manager Hope for revitalisation as part of the Australia’s Green Cauldron Project</td>
<td>Funding and in-kind support from LGAs Seed funding from respective State Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia’s Green Cauldron [AGC]</td>
<td>QLD: Scenic Rim, Gold Coast NSW: Byron Bay, Clarence Valley, Kyogle, Richmond Valley, Lismore, Tweed</td>
<td>Local council response to Federal National Landscapes program directed by Parks Australia [PA] and Tourism Australia [TA]</td>
<td>Brand region to attract international visitors to Australia Leverage international promotion provided by Tourism Australia</td>
<td>Federal Government Australia’s National Landscapes program ceased in 2014 Web presence remains, with no association with Tourism Australia</td>
<td>Funding and in-kind support from LGAs Funding from both State tourism agencies Unsuccessful applications for Federal Government funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 The Rainforest Way

During the mid to late 1990s, there were several tourism plans from the NSW and QLD State Tourism Agencies that recognised the importance of nature-based and ecotourism in the market place. These included the QLD Ecotourism Plan (Department of Small Business and Industry QLD 1997) and the Tourism NSW Strategic Plan (Tourism NSW 1999). Although the Rainforest Way [RW] was established with alignment to these plans, the NSW Far North Coast Nature-based and Ecotourism Plan (Manidis Roberts Consultants & Jenny Calkin and Associates 1995) specifically called for a nature-based tourism route to be developed in Northern NSW. This was reported as the main impetus for the development of the RW (Derrett et al. 2000). The aim of the project was to establish a way to attract tourists to less travelled roads and towns, while also spreading the tourism benefit throughout the broader region, as opposed to each LGA only focusing on its own region (Derrett et al. 2000). This is very much in keeping with the expected outcomes of such a project as 'the concept of a touring route or “way” is to guide visitors through the most attractive parts of a region and to direct them to lesser known areas' (Mackellar & Derrett 2006: 278-9).

The project began as a grass-roots project in the late 1990s. A passionate Tourism Officer from Casino in the Clarence Valley Shire drove the project, travelling to various councils to gain support and funding to establish a touring route throughout the inland parts of the NSW Northern Rivers region. According to a Richmond Valley Shire Council (2002) report, it came into being in 2002. As a testament to this initial work, it was recognised in the first publicly available document regarding the touring route – a draft strategic plan – that Lismore, Richmond Valley and Kyogle Shires in NSW had committed to the project, as well as Tourism NSW. In the same report, it was stated that further support was required from other actors in NSW and SEQ. It specifically outlined the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coastal Network</th>
<th>QLD: Gold Coast (primarily Southern Gold Coast)</th>
<th>NSW: Tweed</th>
<th>Seafood Discovery Trail</th>
<th>Increase domestic and international visitation to the Southern Gold Coast and Tweed</th>
<th>PDF brochure available via a Google search</th>
<th>No mention of the project on the CSGC or Tweed Tourism websites</th>
<th>Funded by DMO operational budgets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooly Rocks On was a local response by local DMOs to a directive from the CSGC board</td>
<td>Increase domestic and international visitation to the Southern Gold Coast and Tweed</td>
<td>Own project website, linked to via CSGC and Tweed Tourism websites</td>
<td>Funding and in-kind support from CSGC, Destination Tweed and Events QLD</td>
<td>Source: Developed for this research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Such collaboration would improve the visitor experience as well as the marketing strength of the project. Responses are therefore sought from the following authorities as to their level of commitment to the project:

1. Tweed Tourism
2. Beaudesert Shire
3. Gold Coast Tourism Bureau
4. Tourism Queensland
5. NPWS [NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service]
6. Queensland Parks
7. CERRA (Derrett et al. 2000: 19).

This request for support from the various LGAs, as well as from several State agencies, suggests that it was realised soon before the RW draft strategic plan was developed, that the region needed to be broadened or that the other actors were refusing to commit to the project. In the final version of the report, produced two years later, all the actors listed were said to have committed to the project, which also recognised ‘secondary areas’ including the local stakeholders (‘the Clarence, Ballina, and Byron Shires in NSW and Boonah Shire in Qld’; Richmond Valley Shire Council 2002: 4) depicted in Figure 7.1. Demonstrating the limited cross-border work previously completed, it was nevertheless seen as a significant outcome to have representation of actors from various agencies at the local and state scales:

The process has offered an opportunity for collaboration between all levels of government, tourism managers and natural resource managers to work towards one vision; to develop and promote a primary touring route with complimentary experiential loops and trails through Northern Rivers NSW and South-East Queensland which will provide enhanced experiences for visitors and greater environmental, cultural, social and economic benefits for the cross-border regions (Richmond Valley Shire Council 2002: 1).

The main reason given for the establishment of the RW in the final strategic plan was the failure of the previous approach to promoting the CERRA, which was said to be an ‘immense natural attraction [that] is sometimes lost due to the geographical spread of the individual sites. Additionally, the region has suffered from fragmented marketing practices, especially in the lack of cross border cooperative marketing’ (Richmond Valley Shire Council 2002: 6). Apart from explaining what the Rainforest Way brand stood for and outlining the regions included, minimal direction was given as to what activities would be involved in the collaborative project.
Following the development of the final RW strategic plan, a consultancy was commissioned to develop a marketing plan for the RW. It established a slogan – ‘The Way to the Rainforests’ (Planning for People 2005: 3) – and indicated that the touring route should be targeted at two main markets according to the Tourism NSW market segments. These were:

**True Travellers:** ‘Experimental, adventurous, trail-blazing, immersion travellers who want to experience a single destination in depth, active, overseas orientation, seeking difference and challenge, opinion-leaders, white collar and male skew, take longer holidays, will spend more getting there than being there, definitely DIY’ (Central Coast Tourism 2010: 15).

**Wanders:** ‘Adult couples, empty nesters, frequent tourists, DIY, great off-peak market, keen observers, wide range of preferences in transport, favour difference, continue ‘Darby & Joan’ lifestyle when travelling, like to potter’ (Central Coast Tourism 2010: 15).
The marketing plan incorporated an analysis of the main competitors for the RW, which were said to be Wet Tropical QLD, the State of Tasmania and CERRA. This strongly suggests a domestic focus of the project, but also some confusion as to the situation of the project, considering the rainforests making up CERRA were said to be at the very heart of the RW touring route (Richmond Valley Shire Council 2002). The marketing plan outlined two benefits of the project crossing the border, which were to spread visitation throughout the broader region and the inclusion of the QLD Rainforest Centres in Nerang and Maliananee. Along with the two benefits, seven limitations were recognised: a lack of signage, unsealed roads throughout the region, a lack of tourism infrastructure, a lack of services on the western side of the region, difficulties in marketing a cross-border initiative, and the overall sustainability of the product and destination (Planning for People 2005). It appears that, even at this early stage, the differences in the level of development across the region and the difficulties of cross-border marketing were predicted as constraints for the project.

The marketing plan outlined the planned initial stages of the project, including the aim to gain initial seed funding from government agencies, and then for the project to become self-sustainable through the payment of membership and advertising fees by businesses in the region. It was later found that, following undisclosed amounts of funding from Local and State Governments, this self-sufficiency did not eventuate. In one study of the businesses in the region, it was found that awareness of the project was low and, among those businesses that were aware, a high level of suspicion existed regarding the management of the project (Smith 2005, 2011).

The lack of awareness could be partly seen in two separate newspaper reports on touring in the area. In 2006, the touring route was discussed in a travel review, but rather than referring to the RW, the self-drive adventure was called ‘the border run’ (Wright 2006). Further confusion could be seen in an article that reported on the RW as ‘Australia’s newest touring route’ long after the project began (Lancaster 2011). According to the initial consultants on the project (Mackellar & Derrett 2006), a lack of support from State Government Departments in terms of promotion and road signage, a lack of clear leaders and the project not being clearly linked to strategies were among the reasons for the lack of awareness in the region. Smith (2005, 2011) also reported ‘border issues’ as a constraint for the RW, without further delving, suggesting there was more to the lack of success and eventual demise of the CBTME than the consultants realised. While the RW was a community initiative, it enjoyed only limited political support at the State Government scale on either side of the border.
Once the government funding for the project was depleted (around 2005), the intellectual property attached to the project was transferred to a NSW RTO, Northern Rivers Tourism (NRT), which determined that the project was no longer viable (Participant 16, RTO CEO). Despite this, the RW featured in the Gold Coast Destination Management Plan, having been recognised as requiring infrastructure on the QLD side (Tourism QLD 2005), and then also in the first version of the Gold Coast Opportunity Plan for 2009-2018, where it was recognised to have potential for linking to a Gold Coast food cluster (EC3 Global 2008). In a revision of the plan, the RW was no longer included as an opportunity (EC3 Global 2012), while the most recent QLD ecotourism plan, at the time of this study, mentioned the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia (which it said were more well-known) and AGC (Department of National Parks Recreation Sport and Racing 2013). This suggests the RW was either not considered a strategic priority at the State scale, or that the relevant QLD State agencies were simply not aware of the project.

While the RW was not seen as viable by NRT and was not recognised in the State or Regional Tourism Plans at the time of this research, the consultants for AGC saw potential for the touring route to contribute to the AGC tourist experience. In the AGC Experience Development Strategy (TRC Tourism 2012b: 7), it was stated:

> To harness the potential of existing experiences and provide a framework for new product opportunities, reinvigoration of the RW should be seen as a priority for attracting both international and domestic day and overnight self-drive visitors. With a clearer focus on high quality ‘must do’ attractions, it has the potential to provide high quality journeys linking the collective appeal of AGC communities and key experiences and products.

According to the consultants who completed the experience development strategy [EDS] for AGC, despite being an important contribution to tourism in the region, the ‘drive route has gained limited traction for a range of reasons, including possible confusion caused by the broad range of choices offered to the consumer and non-targeted marketing’ (TRC Tourism 2012b: 19). Notwithstanding the conclusion reached by most of the participants in this research that the RW had met its demise, some hoped that, with re-evaluation, re-positioning and re-investment, the project may be resurrected as part of AGC (TRC Tourism 2012a), which is the second CBTME to be discussed.
7.3 **Australia’s Green Cauldron**

To understand AGC, it is important to first consider the larger Federal Program within which it was situated. The National Landscapes program resulted from a recommendation in the Australian Tourism White Paper that emphasised the importance of Parks Australia [PA] and Tourism Australia [TA] having a stronger partnership (Australian Government 2003). This was considered particularly important, given that, at least in NSW, ‘historically an effective partnership between parks and tourism is more noted by its absence rather than its success’ (National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008: 1). This can be seen in a quote in the *Sydney Morning Herald* in 2008 by the NSW Chief Executive of the National Parks Association saying he would “die in a ditch” protecting national parks from commercialisation by the tourism industry’ (National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008: 1). Collaboration between parks agencies and tourism agencies in Australia appears to be an ongoing issue (Tolkach et al. 2016).

Irrespective of the issues within the States, PA and TA worked in partnership to lead a mainly government reference committee to establish the National Landscape Program, which was the first nation-wide program that saw parks agencies and tourism agencies work together (Tolkach et al. 2016). It aimed to identify and promote Australia’s ‘top 20 superlative nature experiences’, of which the AGC is one. Due to the cessation of the program in 2014, only 16 landscapes ended up being selected, including four border-crossing landscapes (Figure 7.2).

![Figure 7.2 Map of Australia’s National Landscapes](source: Tourism Australia (2014))

---

37 This perspective was also recognised as an issue in a review of the tourism industry in NSW (O’Neill 2008).
The key driver of the National Landscape project was to strengthen the branding of Australia’s natural assets, which had not been done well in the past. This was recognised in the context of Australia becoming increasingly reliant on the growth of international inbound tourism and the highly competitive ‘experience seeker’ market (National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008: 1). This group of international travellers were the target market of the National Landscape Program and were described as follows by Tourism Australia (2008b: 2):

- Experienced international travellers.
- Seek out and enjoy authentic personal experiences they can talk about.
- Involve themselves in holiday activities, are sociable and enjoy engaging with the locals.
- Active in their pursuits and come away having learnt something.
- Somewhat adventurous and enjoy a variety of experiences on any single trip.
- Place high importance on value and hence critically balance benefits with costs.
- Place high value on contrasting experiences (i.e. different from their day-to-day lives).

Following the formation of the National Landscape Reference Committee [NLRC] in 2005, which included the Directors of PA and TA, actors in regions across Australia were given the opportunity to declare an interest for their region to become a National Landscape, form a steering committee and submit an application for initial assessment. According to the guidelines available to potential National Landscapes, ‘to be eligible for consideration as a National Landscape, a region must demonstrate a high degree of stakeholder interest and commitment and be able to show to the NLRC that they have the potential to meet the National Landscape selection criteria to a very high level’. It was also considered important for the ‘State and Territory Tourism Organisations to ensure that the area has sufficient international export ready product to participate in the program’ (Tourism Australia 2010: 1).

Despite the emphasis given by the NLRC to National Landscapes following ‘experience boundaries’, which may or may not be contained within political boundaries (National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008; Tourism Australia 2008a), the importance of gaining State support appeared to be a significant requirement. The Chair of the Murray Tri-State National Landscapes Committee (which straddled the States of NSW, South Australia and Victoria, and is unified by the Murray River) was devastated that the main reason given for the lack of success of the region’s application was ‘no general support from Tourism Victoria and Tourism NSW’ (Plowman 2011; Strudwick 2009). This supports the point that activity by borderlanders that aims to benefit their border region can be significantly impacted by decisions, indecision and/or a lack of commitment at higher scales. Also in line with this point was the decision by the Chair of the Murray Tri-State National Landscapes Committee to resign and focus on supporting his region ‘outside Government management’ (Plowman 2011).
This supports the conclusion that borderlanders may avoid and work around frustrating higher political scales (Herzog 1991; House 1980; Martinez 1994b).

According to the AGC’s first Chair and Project Manager (Participant 19), the proceeding RW project significantly boosted the eligibility of the region, having built numerous links among partners at various scales including at some relevant state departments, and was the main cause of success in being named a National Landscape in the second round of review. A press release from the Australian Government provided official confirmation that AGC had been included in the National Landscapes program on 6 October 2008. Martin Ferguson, Federal Minister for Tourism at the time, explained that ‘attaining National Landscapes status means this special region will benefit from increased exposure in Tourism Australia’s significant global marketing initiatives’ (Bradley 2008). Quite soon after this announcement, it was reported in the media that ‘a large area of northern New South Wales and South-East Queensland has a new name’, and that ‘Tourism Australia has dubbed the 5,000 square kilometres Australia’s “Green Cauldron”’ (ABC News 2008). This demonstrates the focus of the media on the rebordering of the region, from a space of division to one of common focus and branding (Brambilla 2014; Paasi 2010). The actors in the region, however, could only know the extent of the common focus.

After being named a National Landscape, the region grew to include Mount Barney and Main Range National Parks, on the edge of the Scenic Rim Shire, and was then limited to include Mount Barney National Park and the township of Boonah (see Figure 7.3). Rather than being a ‘brand based experience boundary’, which includes the most important features of the natural landscape (Tourism Australia 2008a: 7), the boundary was formed through a political social process, as per the arguments of Paasi (1996, 2010), where tourism actors negotiate as to how much of their region should be included. It is unlikely that an “experience boundary” would naturally be a perfect circle. Analysing secondary sources, Tolkach et al. (2016) recognised that the National Landscapes program had potential for a lack of clarity and disagreement regarding the size of an experience boundary in a National Landscape, and this seemed to be playing out in AGC.

The EDS (TRC Tourism 2012b: iii) stated that the ‘proposition to Experience Seekers is grounded in three dimensions:

- ‘A well-preserved volcanic caldera enveloped by rainforests (many of which are World Heritage listed);
- A globally recognised marine environment; and
- Diverse and “culturally rich” communities’.
The vision statement for AGC was:

Each and every visitor to Australia’s Green Cauldron will leave inspired and touched by their experience of our region’s world class surfing, marine and rainforest opportunities, spiritual values, cultural connections, creative communities and sustainable lifestyles.

Figure 7.3 Australia’s Green Cauldron Experience Boundary 2009-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original depiction of the AGC experience boundary, as originally displayed on the Tourism Australia (2009) promotional webpage. The boundary includes Bangalow, Woodenbong, Beaudesert and Nerang on its outskirts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2011, when the first AGC Experience Strategy Concept (TRC Tourism 2011: 3) was made public, the experience boundary included Lismore to the south and most of the newly amalgamated Scenic Rim Council, including Main Range National Park in its entirety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the draft (TRC Tourism 2012a: 2) and final (TRC Tourism 2012b: 5) versions of the EDS documents, the boundary had changed once again. This time, the boundary was a perfect circle that had grown to the south, to include Casino, but shrunk in the north-east, with the boundary stopping at the Boonah township and excluding much of the Main Range National Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research. Sources cited within.
The EDS document stressed the project area included proximity to major gateways and established tourism destinations, the opportunity to experience the hinterland and coast in one day, multiple experiences available within a compact region and communities with a strong commitment to sustainability and the environment (TRC Tourism 2012b). A more critical perspective, however, would consider that the region was very large (and hence not terribly easy to traverse in a single day) and the communities included were heterogeneous (with differing commitments to sustainability and the environment). The EDS also stated three weaknesses of the program, which were a lack of profile of AGC, a ‘lack of critical mass of unique and compelling propositions in the hinterland to supplement the existing attractions on the Gold Coast and Byron Bay’, as well as the difficulties due to ‘multiple political, local government and tourism jurisdictions with established brands (Gold Coast, Scenic Rim, Tweed, Byron Bay) [which] can limit collective action’ (TRC Tourism 2012b: 27).

The decisions made at the State scale provide initial insights into the early issues that plagued the project, as it existed across a political border. In QLD, the National Landscape project was recognised in a State Ecotourism Plan stating that AGC was ‘more commonly known as the Gondwana Rainforests of Australia’ (Department of National Parks Recreation Sport and Racing 2013: 13), which suggests differences between local, state and federal scale branding decisions. Further reading of the plan reveals that the State agency’s main interest was in ensuring that the Fraser Coast was recognised as a National Landscape within the next round of review and working with PA and TA to do this. In the NSW State plans for tourism and parks management, neither the National Landscape Program nor AGC were recognised. Rather, NSW Parks and Wildlife (2008: 29) simply grouped the Northern Rivers with the ‘Coast and coastal ranges bioregions’, categorising the north section as ‘South-East Queensland’ but showing no interest in the rest of the SEQ region (see Figure 5.2, on page 105). There was no evidence that tourism and parks agencies in the State were linked in any way, unlike those at the Federal scale. This shows that, within and between scales, there were different epistemological perspectives in the way regions are defined, discussed and managed.

The AGC was developed to attract adventurous tourists from overseas to primarily visit the world heritage listed rainforests. While the project was initiated by agencies at the Federal scale, local tourism borderlanders drove it. In both States, there appeared to have been some level of support as the original bid for inclusion of the AGC in the National Landscape Program was successful, but State support was rarely acknowledged. It was confirmed that the Federal Government was no longer pursuing the National Landscape Program from 2014, following a change of Federal Government in 2013 (Participant 24, Federal Government Agency Director). From 2014, a website promoting AGC was established (Australia’s Green Cauldron 2014), with no association to PA and TA.
7.4 THE COASTAL NETWORK

Unlike the other CBTMEs detailed in the previous sections, the Coastal Network was made up of two main episodes that involved a mixture of actors over time working on different projects, but with the common link between the projects having taken place in a specific geographical region. The region included what has been called the Southern Gold Coast and Tweed (usually only referring to the more built-up parts of the shire, particularly Tweed Heads). Although cross-border episodes have been occurring for quite some time, such as the cross-border meeting held when the border was shut by QLD in 1919 (Sydney Mail 1919b) and the commissioning of a consultant to consider promoting Coolangatta and Tweed as a single entity (Verve Consulting 2007), this research considers two episodes that had clear aims to work more collaboratively across the border.

7.4.1 THE SEAFOOD DISCOVERY TRAIL

In 2008, the Gold Coast City Council made the decision to promote three main tourism precincts along the length of the coast of the region, linking to the multi-nodal concept in the literature (Dredge & Jamal 2013; Russell & Faulkner 2004). One of the regions was the ‘Southern Gold Coast’, ‘which was defined as postcodes 4223, 4224 and 4225’. At the time of this research, this included the most southern suburbs of the Gold Coast, directly adjacent to the border. As part of this approach, a new organisation was established; it was called Connecting Southern Gold Coast [CSGC], wholly owned by Gold Coast City Council and funded by a levy on the businesses of the Southern Gold Coast (Institute of Business Leaders 2009: 3). In 2009, a Gold Coast based business association called the Institute of Business Leaders, with research assistance from staff of Southern Cross University, developed an Economic Development Strategy for the region. It put in place a board with members from various sectors to oversee the organisation and to employ a CEO for the organisation (Gold Coast Business 2009a). It also outlined a set of planning principles for the Southern Gold Coast to ‘advance its future economic prospects by protecting, enhancing and promoting its:

- Natural environment of surf, beaches and hinterland, including access to the Tweed;
- Creative knowledge and productive base, mainly around surfing, education and health; and
- Proximity to other attractions – to the north, Surfers Paradise; and to the south, Tweed Shire and Byron Bay’ (Institute of Business Leaders 2009: 8).
The Strategy developed indicated two main issues. The first was that the organisation name Connecting Southern Gold Coast suggested that the Southern Gold Coast was not previously “connected” to the rest of the Gold Coast, implying that the region was on the periphery of, or had fallen behind, the rest of the LGA, with the core located in the northern parts of the LGA (such as Southport and Surfers’ Paradise). The second issue that was made clear by the strategy document was the importance of the newly formed organisation working across the border with the Tweed Shire. In terms of tourism, the document explicitly stated the importance of CSGC working collaboratively with Tweed to develop a ‘sustainable tourism industry’ (Institute of Business Leaders 2009: 15).

Among the key performance indicators of this development of a sustainable tourism industry was the implementation of a Seafood Discovery Trail, which began in 2009. The CSGC strategy document referred to the project, but the aims, objectives and strategies of the project itself were not publicly available (assuming they existed). The main outcome of the project, the Seafood Discovery Trail promotional guide/pamphlet, included a joint introduction and welcome message from the CEO of CSGC and the General Manager of what was at the time Tweed Tourism (a new organisation had been formed by the time of this research, called Destination Tweed). It explained that the Trail was meant to be a ‘guide to exploring the abundance of seafood delivered by the oceans, rivers and waterways of the Southern Gold Coast and Tweed regions […] focussing on 35kms of the coastline from Currumbin to Cabarita’ (Southern Gold Coast & Tweed Tourism Inc. 2010: 3). From an industry perspective, the project was intended to develop a cluster of seafood businesses. The rest of the pamphlet included a map of the trail (see Figure 7.4) and a set of advertisements for the businesses along the trail.

The Seafood Discovery Trail gained media attention in print and on television (Channel 7 2010; Lloyd 2010) but, not long after, it was questioned whether the project was effective or worthwhile. This first happened in a cross-border meeting (held 15 February 2011) among actors in the region, followed by email correspondence between the CEOs of CSGC and Destination Tweed. The CEO of CSGC made the following point: ‘we need to work out how we can get the Seafood Discovery Trail into the land of the living, if possible – and if not possible, we need to terminate it’ (Wilson 2011). As the website for the project was taken down later in 2011, it is apparent that the project was terminated.
In 1978, the Wintersun Festival began in the twin towns of Coolangatta, QLD and Tweed Heads, NSW. Beginning as a local festival, it soon became a nostalgia festival attracting between 60,000 and 80,000 visitors, mainly from Australia and New Zealand (NSW Legislative Assembly 2010a). While it was managed at the local scale, involving DMOs from both sides of the border, the Project Manager and Director for much of the time was Barry McNamara (Participant 2, Chamber of Commerce President). It was estimated that the event grew to a point where it injected $20 million into the border region economy (Potts 2010b: 1). This was until 2010, when it was announced that McNamara had successfully lobbied Events NSW to move the event south, to Port Macquarie (Stoner 2011; Wauchope Gazette 2011), in return for funding from the NSW Government. In one of the border region newspapers, it was reported that the event ‘leaves twin towns after 33 years’, citing the Member of State Parliament for Tweed as saying that ‘our area has been absolutely sold out and ignored which has led to becoming a victim of cross-border issues’ (Potts 2010b: 3).

Source: Tweed Tourism Inc. and Connecting Southern Gold Coast (2010: 6-7)
The Hansard of the NSW Parliament showed that the State Government claimed ‘success in winning the Wintersun Festival for the State of NSW and, in particular, for regional [rural] New South Wales’ (NSW Legislative Assembly 2010a: 24648). The response of the Opposition was to emphasise that the point was not about ‘spruiking that New South Wales had claimed this major event, when it was actually pinched from another area of New South Wales’ (NSW Legislative Assembly 2010b: 22870). A press release from the Minister for Fair Trade and the Arts, a portfolio that also contained tourism, confirmed that there was a clear perception that the cross-border event had been “won” from QLD (Klug 2010), despite its importance to the Coolangatta and Tweed region.

Considering the ongoing issues among the board of the event in the years prior to its moving, CSGC and Destination Tweed had prepared to replace the event with a similar event at the same time of the year. It was considered important to do this as the event was an important means for increasing visitation in the slower, cooler period of the year (Killoran 2011; Macdonald 2010a). Not without concern among businesses over the event’s name, which only recognised the QLD side of the border (Macdonald 2010a), Coolangatta, the Cooly Rocks On festival was born in June 2011. In common with the previous event, despite support from local businesses and DMOs on both sides of the border, State politics and, specifically, uneven State support impacted the event. This was reported in the media under the title ‘Cooly Rocks On snubbed by NSW’, which stated that Events QLD had pledged a total of $130 000 over the first three years of the event while ‘Events NSW has so far failed to offer any support’ (Masters 2011). The Tweed LGA provided funding to the event on the condition that funding would only be used on the NSW side of the border, while the Gold Coast City Council provided unconditional funding.

In the first year that Cooly Rocks On ran, over a ten-day period, it was reported that it attracted 90,000 visitors to the border region and that this visitation figure was considerably higher than any of the previous years, while the event was running as the Wintersun Festival (Tuttielt 2011a, 2011b). Despite the optimism for the inaugural event, concern was sparked in 2012 by a decision, made by the QLD State Government, to amend the Holidays Act 1983 to allow for the Queen’s Birthday public holiday to be moved from June, when the event normally runs, to October. This was not being considered in NSW, which meant that only one State would recognise a long weekend during the event and potentially impact visitation by Queenlanders (Killoran 2011).

The Wintersun Festival and then the Cooly Rocks On festivals appear to have been scuttled by the location of the event across the border, with many of the issues resulting from decisions made by State Governments and responses of the local borderlanders to these decisions.
7.5 CONCLUSION

Chapter 7 introduced three CBTME in the case study border region. It was the final chapter that aimed to critically examine the South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for CBTM (Research Objective 3) and, as such, it linked the border region context, discussed in the prior chapters, and the opportunities and challenges discussed in Chapters 8 and 9. It contributes one of the first analyses of cross-border tourism episodes, as opposed to the more common investigation of the constraints to greater integration of government areas across borders. Four key findings were made in the chapter.

Firstly, cross-border tourism projects can change significantly over both time and space. It was observed in the CBTMEs that, over time, different actors, at a range of scales, expanded and contracted their involvement in certain cross-border projects. At some points in time, actors in certain areas had limited interest in contributing to cross-border efforts; at other times, such activity aligned with their organisation’s policy priorities and interests. The areas covered by cross-border tourism projects changed over time through a negotiated process, lending support to the arguments made by Paasi (1996, 2011). In other words, the “rebordering” of the border region through cross-border tourism projects was a dynamic, social process.

Secondly, the CBTMEs were driven by individuals and their ongoing persistence in navigating the complexities and messiness of cross-border activities. This finding supports the arguments, such as those of Gelbman and Keinan (2007), that cross-border work is not completed by regions, but rather by individuals within border communities. While two episodes were completely locally initiatives, the third CBTME (AGC) was initiated as a result of a Federal Government initiative. However, it was still driven by a local committee that was required to argue the importance of the region for inclusion in the national program. This finding aligns with Lovelock and Boyd’s (2006) finding about the importance of local actors in the success or failure of more collaborative tourism efforts in the Catlins region in New Zealand.

Thirdly, local governments, and the people working within them, can play a key role in subnational border tourism management. Across the three CBTMEs, local governments certainly did, often initiating and driving the projects. This finding supports research that has argued the importance of local governments in regional tourism destination management, especially within Australia (Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Lickorish & Jenkins 1997). This may not be the case in all countries, given the different government structures in each nation (European Union 2009; Kratke 1999; Quack 2006; Scott & Collins 1997; Stöber 2011). However, it supports the subsidiarity principle underlying Australia’s system of government, according to which the scale of government closest to the issue is required to deal with it (Head 2006).
Despite Australian local governments having limited resources and powers (Dollery & Crase 2004; Dollery & Johnson 2005; Dredge et al. 2011a) to manage border issues, which exist mainly due to higher scales, their constituents are impacted by the border on a daily basis, meaning they are required to take action.

Fourthly, while local governments and individuals in the border region initiated and drove cross-border efforts, the episodes were highly dependent on funding and tourism data from higher scales. This finding contributes to our understanding of subnational border regions, showing subnational border regions show a degree of similarity with international border regions in locations like the EU, where it has been found cross-border projects need to be locally driven, but funding decisions are made by higher scales, such as the European Commission (OECD 2013; Zimmerbauer 2011). Also, as in the EU situation, the episodes focused on in this thesis relied heavily on higher scales for funding and tourism data, but higher scales were not involved in governance or objective setting for the projects (OECD 2013). In subnational border regions, high reliance on funding from higher scales means that, when funding ends, so can cross-border projects. Given the vertical fiscal imbalance (OECD 2015) and under-resourcing of local governments (Dollery & Crase 2004; Dollery & Johnson 2005; Dredge et al. 2011a) in Australia, it is unsurprising this is the case. Prior to consideration of further challenges to CBTMEs in Chapter 9, the following chapter focuses on the opportunities that were found.
Chapter 8 | Opportunities in the Central East Coast Border Region

This chapter deals with the opportunities found for CBTM in the case study Australian subnational border region. It is the first of two chapters that aims to synthesise and evaluate the opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM in the subnational border region of South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales (Research Objective 4). Drawing on the findings in the previous three chapters, as well as on a range of data sources, it discusses seven themes that emerged regarding opportunities for CBTM in the border region from the perspective of the participants. The chapter concludes by synthesising and evaluating the implications of the themes with respect to our knowledge of tourism management in subnational border regions. Chapter 9 then considers the challenges to cross-border tourism in the case study border region.

8.1 Increasing the Diversity of Tourism Experiences

The most cited reason for working outside of an actor’s administrative region, and more specifically across the State border, was to provide tourists with a broader product offering. In numerous cases, on both sides of the border, it was recognised that each region had advantages and disadvantages, which could be sold as part of a larger and more diverse experience. At the Gold Coast, a local government Councillor expressed the opinion that, due to changing tastes among visitors, it is important for the Gold Coast to also make the most of what is available to tourists across the border:

We should be selling the attractions in Northern NSW as reasons for visiting the Gold Coast, because if you want your backpackers and that sort of market, they can still stay on the Gold Coast and go to those activities. I mean, we’ve got a massive amount of accommodation here, so we should be working very closely with them.

( Participant 9, Councillor)

In a similar vein, the President of the Southern Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce argued the need to sell more than just what is available at the Southern Gold Coast:

The Southern Gold Coast and Northern NSW share a lot of the natural attributes that people want these days – to get away from the rat race and enjoy all the beautiful stuff. I think an important part of the issue here is that people need to know more about the region and the region needs to be promoted more for its natural beauty. I love Northern NSW. I mean, it’s not the Gold Coast and I think...
that it helps that we have more than what is just within our borders that tourists would enjoy. (Participant 2, Chamber of Commerce President)

Across the border, in the Tweed, it was recognised that, while the Gold Coast may not have the same number of natural features of interest to certain groups of tourists, accommodation was lacking across much of the Northern Rivers and the Scenic Rim, making it a necessity to see their tourism offering as including the broader cross-border region. One actor whose administrative region was in the Northern Rivers explained:

If tourists are going to the Gold Coast, they may also come here as day-trippers to see the wildlife and natural environment. The fact is, we need those tourists because we don’t have much accommodation beyond the Gold Coast and the Tweed Coast. If places like Mount Warning and Uki had more accommodation and more beds, it would be different, but at the moment only a particular region has most of the accommodation available. Here we have a very under-developed product, while the tourism product in SEQ is very much sophisticated. (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer)

When asked how the more developed Gold Coast would benefit from working with their counterparts across the State border, it was made very clear: ‘they don’t have employment and their product is very narrow’ (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer). These perspectives contrast with the work of Gordon (2007, 2009), who found that many USA actors, particularly elected officials, saw regions (specifically USA counties) across administrative borders as competitors for economic development. The actors in the case study did see benefits of cross-border tourism management, suggesting that business attraction is seen differently to tourist attraction.

Acknowledging the benefit of offering tourists a broader experience by working collaboratively across political-administrative borders also contrasts with the findings of research showing that different levels of tourism and economic development act as a challenge to cross-border tourism (Buursink 2001; Cameron 2014; Henderson 2001; Timothy 2000a; Timothy & Teye 2004). The actors in the case study could see that these differences were actually a source of interest for tourists, providing a highly developed tourism experience at the Gold Coast, and part of Tweed, and a less developed, natural tourism experience in the Tweed Valley and Scenic Rim.

One actor, who had been working on the RW and AGC projects almost since their inception, recognised that such views have not always existed. While, historically, QLD had shown little interest in what was occurring over the border, this attitude showed signs of changing:
I think they are also understanding the need to develop new product, particularly now as the Gold Coast is struggling. When you look at it, the Gold Coast, it is very much man-made and it makes much more sense to try to incorporate some of the natural environment into the tourism offering. (Participant 19, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

This point was made by another Northern Rivers actor who expressed that ‘from a tourism perspective, while the Gold Coast has high visitor numbers, they also have a very narrow product’ (Participant 7, RDA CEO). An actor at the Gold Coast, when asked whether the Gold Coast needs to work across the border, shared this impression:

Oh, please! Not everybody wants what the Gold Coast has – not everyone wants beaches! I think that sort of thinking could be to the detriment of the Gold Coast. People are changing in what they want from a tourism experience, and if your mind isn’t open to that change, well, “Get out of the tourism industry” is my thought. Certainly, diversification is not only a good thing, but necessary for the Gold Coast. That is not only the diversification of tourism either – other economic activities are important, too. This would reduce the impact that economic downturns and currency rates would have on the Gold Coast… I mean, the unemployment rate here at the moment is almost double the national average. (Participant 15, Economic Development Department Principle Tourism Officer)

While cross-border collaboration in tourism and other areas had not previously been of interest among some actors in the border region, particularly in QLD, the global and national environment was exerting pressure on Australian tourism destinations. Among the external pressures at the time was the Global Financial Crisis (The Courier Mail 2012), a high Australian dollar (Gold Coast Tourism Corporation 2010; The Courier Mail 2012), negative media attention regarding the image of the Gold Coast38 (Gold Coast Primary Care Partnership Council 2009; Murphy 2012), and natural disasters, such as cyclones and widespread flooding, in QLD throughout 2010-2011 (The Courier Mail 2011, 2012)39. These pressures in the external environment may provide what Wang and Fesenmaier (2007) call a precondition for tourism collaboration to occur.

38 Such arguments regarding the image of the Gold Coast are not new (e.g. Stewart 1992).
39 It was reported that tourism in the border region was impacted due to a misrepresentation and misperception that the entire State of Queensland was effected, when SEQ was not (The Courier Mail 2011).
This situation also reinforces the temporal aspect of border regions. Highly influenced by situational and contextual elements (Newman & Paasi 1998), meanings of borders are in a constant state of flux because of the agency of social actors (Paasi 2009, 2010). As regions that are ‘constantly being reproduced in various social practices’ (Zimmerbauer 2011: 213), it is possible that what, one day, are seen as opportunities to work across the border may become less important at another point in time. One such example may be for tourism actors on the Gold Coast to become increasingly internally oriented with the countdown to the 2018 Commonwealth Games (Queensland Government 2016).

While calls for increased economic diversity have been made in the Tweed region, given the region’s high reliance on tourism (Potts 2010a; TRA 2011a), the Chair of the Tweed Chamber of Commerce was less interested in collaborative arrangements across the border. He was more interested in recognising how other well-known regions can be used to position his own region:

We sit between two high profile destinations – being Byron and the Gold Coast – and we try to position ourselves between them. We do that particularly for the New Zealand market. We try to paint the picture that this is the place to stay and do Byron, the Gold Coast or Brisbane. (Participant 1, Chamber of Commerce Chairperson)

This acknowledges ‘that borders can be viewed from a multiplicity of (sometimes contradictory) perspectives’ (Rumford 2012: 894). While some actors see the importance of attempting to work more collaboratively with other actors to maximise diversity of product offerings, others are much more internally fixated – focusing more on how their region can benefit from the location and position of other regions. While this could be a starting point for the emergence of collaboration, such a view would seem at odds with the key characteristic of collaboration, which requires interdependence, joint ownership and collective responsibility (Jamal & Getz 1995). Another starting point for the emergence of more collaborative efforts can be seen in decisions made by tourism actors at the operational level. One actor who had worked at the Tweed Visitor Information Centre explained how the broader region is normally considered when providing advice to tourists based on their individual needs:

Frequently we get asked here, where is the best place for us to go and see rainforests? Invariably, if they look like a family with a few kids, who aren’t terribly bush-oriented, who just want a glimpse of the rainforest, we send them inter-state – we send them to QLD. Often we’ll send them to Natural Arch, out of the shire. And that’s unofficial, you know we’re not supposed, but they’ve nice paved walking tracks, it has adequate car parking most of the time and it has a
creek and waterfall. It has all the things you need, rather than the bunfight to get a park at Mount Warning. (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager)

This suggests that opportunities exist both at the strategic scale and at the operational level, where the main concern among local operational tourism actors is less about administrative borders and more about matching tourism experiences with individual expectations. This was also the perspective of the Tourism Development Officer (Participant 6) in the Scenic Rim Council, who had concerns about the way that their ‘very rural region’ was part of the Brisbane RTO. In considering the most current Tourism Plan (The Stafford Group 2008) for the RTO, at the time, it was observable how the region does seem at odds with a plan that has an almost entirely urban focus. Given this situation, the actor expressed CBTM as an opportunity:

The Scenic Rim is more aligned, product wise, with the councils across the border than with the regions within the State, meaning that we are much more likely to extend our tourism experiences south rather than north. (Participant 6, Council Tourism Development Officer)

An actor in Tweed also stated this alignment with the region across the border:

For tourism, they [the NSW State Government] put us in the same group as Grafton and Yamba and other places like that. We’re, on the other hand, Gold Coast centric. We’re not a Grafton or a Lismore. When people are visiting the region, they don’t go south, they travel around Northern NSW and SEQ – it is all one product. (Participant 12, Member of State Parliament)

These statements implicitly recognise the importance of the “experience economy”. King (2002: 108) states that tourism actors need to focus on the ‘relevance of the experience they offer the customer, rather than the destination they promote’. The participants understood that, despite the need to do this, it may be against policy (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager). While the participants found the way they were grouped and managed by higher scales questionable, as predicted by studies of international border regions, the response that the actors had when they saw an opportunity to satisfy visitors to the region was to do what is best for themselves and their region, even if that means circumventing official expectations and views of actors at the core of states (Herzog 1991; Leimgruber 1989; Timothy & Teye 2004).

Despite the potential for political borders to act as tourism attractions (e.g. Timothy 2000a, 2001), the case study region appears to have very little appeal in this way. Except for a small number of border artefacts, the main attractions for the border region at the time of this research were shopping, going to the beach, general sightseeing and bushwalking (see Section 6.1). However, Participant 21 (University Engagement Officer), as well as the local media (Killoran & Jabour 2010), did acknowledge the benefit of the border location in terms of offering a
unique tourist experience, due to daylight saving time differences. Perhaps part of the reason for this not having been acknowledged by others was that the very factor that makes it a unique experience is an issue to borderlanders the rest of the year (see Section 6.2.1):

If you are looking at the nightlife and the entertainment precinct, things like New Years become the destination because you can celebrate New Years twice. You get two lots of fireworks and two celebrations – that means a lot to people. If you can extend that experience for as long as possible I think people try to. (Participant 21, University Engagement Officer)

This section has shown that there was a significant opportunity for cross-border work in the region to capitalise on the opportunity of increasing the diversity of tourism experiences within the region. It was also clear that interest in capitalising on the opportunity was affected by different perspectives of the opportunity, and that such interest changed over time.

8.2 Maximising International Competitiveness

At the beginning of this thesis (Section 1.1), the point was made that globalisation processes are resulting in greater global flows of people, objects and information (Bauman 2000). In the case study border region, these processes were recognised as highly important for Australia’s nature-based tourism industry, which was expected to become increasingly reliant on international inbound visitors (Australian Government 2003). The very aim of the National Landscapes project at the Federal scale was to increase the international competitiveness of Australia through its natural environment (National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008). The Assistant Director of the Program also explained:

When you look internationally, we actually have a situation where national parks are not just brand names, but icons. They are things that people recognise. Even if they don’t know exactly where they are, they have some connection to the concept of that place – whether you are talking about the Serengeti, or Yosemite National Park, or Galapagos, and so on. When you hear those names, you get some sort of sense of image and sense of place in the environment. What we’ve got here in Australia is over 9000 protected areas and national parks. When you get a map and look, it’s really hard to distinguish what the differences are between the various national parks or protected areas. This is because we have put this border approach around most of our parks and protected areas. In fact, you can look around Australia and you will see that many of the national parks butt-up to borders but, on each side of the border, they have completely different names. (Participant 22, Federal Agency Assistant Director).
This point can be illustrated through visualising the case study border region overlaid with the State border and the national parks\textsuperscript{40} in the region. As can be seen in Figure 8.1 National Parks Divided by State Border, numerous national parks (indicated with green edges) exist in the region and many are dissected by the State border (partly due to the border being a mountain ridge), although none share the same name on each side of the border, reinforcing the lack of cross-border park management (see Section 5.3.1). This is part of the reason for one actor suggesting that the State border should be ‘replaced with a more fitting biosphere model’ (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer). Such a model promotes ‘sites established by countries and recognized under UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere Program to promote sustainable development based on local community efforts and sound science’ (UNESCO 2014: 1). This relates to arguments made in other international border regions, that bioregions better link with the reality of ecosystems, which ‘do not respect national [nor subnational] borders’ (Pezzoli \textit{et al.} 2014: 427)\textsuperscript{41}.

Figure 8.1 National Parks Divided by State Border

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{national_parks_divided_by_state_border.png}
\caption{National Parks Divided by State Border}
\end{figure}

Source: Developed for this research
Note: Areas highlighted in green are protected areas and National Parks

\textsuperscript{40} The term \textit{National Park} used in Australia is in most cases a misnomer, as only six National Parks and 13 Marine Parks are managed at the Federal scale (Australian Government 2014b). All the National Parks managed at this scale are within the Territories and, as such, do not fall within the jurisdiction of the States (Department of the Environment 2014a).

\textsuperscript{41} Pezzoli \textit{et al.} (2014) make the same argument regarding the lack of respect that infectious diseases have for political borders in an increasingly mobile society and the need to see bioregions as including both environmental and cultural dimensions.
None of the 14 biosphere reserves recognised in Australia cross State borders, despite five of them abutting a border (DSEWPC 2011). An Assistant Director at PA explained the solution was to consider the tourist’s perspective:

> From a visitor perspective, you must ask: how do you determine what is what? How do you know what the actual experience is that you are going to get when you go to these places? In fact, how do you know what each environment has to offer? National Landscapes aims to make Australia’s nature-based tourism offering more digestible to the visitor. (Participant 22, Federal Agency Assistant Director)

The perspective of this actor follows an argument similar to one advanced by Beritelli et al. (2013: 7): destination management needs to move from politically defined destination regions to ‘strategic business areas’ that change across time and space to reflect demand and competition. The Chair of AGC showed a very strong belief in the necessity of promoting ‘destinations of the third generation’ (7), in what is becoming an increasingly competitive market:

> At the end of the day, a government administrator is just that – an administrator. We have got to turn the project into visitation and return on investment, not what an administrator is looking for… In selling a natural environment we need to compete with other parts of Australia, and the world. If we are going to worry about administrative borders, we are not going to be able to compete with other parts of the world, which will probably do it better. (Participant 20, AGC Chair)

While this provides a rationale for the importance of collaborating across political borders to increase international competitiveness, it also shows an underlying perspective regarding existing approaches to destination management. The view appears to have a clear link to the findings of previous researchers (e.g. Dredge 1999; Pike & Page 2014; Quack 2006) who contend that ‘generally, visitors will define a destination quite differently from industry or from government agencies’ (Jenkins et al. 2011: 24). At the time of the research, this actor, as well as other industry actors, were attempting to work with “government administrators”. Other cross-border projects in Australia, such as the Murray Tri-State project (see Section 7.3), have strayed from actors working together to actors working ‘outside Government management’ (Plowman 2011).

Others saw the opportunity of a large cross-border project in terms of the benefit of exposure for their region. This included actors who felt that their region only played a peripheral role in AGC:

> If we, as the Scenic Rim, get involved in a broader region that is being promoted internationally, it gives us leverage to be part of that promotion. (Participant 6, Council Tourism Development Officer)
In a rural region, west of Tweed called Kyogle, the Economic Development Manager expressed the priority he had given the cross-border project:

> We know that we have something special out here, but we need to work with the bigger players, particularly the Gold Coast across the border, to get the exposure to international markets. Without a cross-border promotion like National Landscapes, we would have trouble simply promoting our region to people in Sydney or Brisbane, let alone Europe or America! (Participant 23, Council Economic Development Manager)

One actor who had been working in tourism in the Tweed region for over two decades acknowledged the leverage potential of having an internationally known brand representing the border region when initiating new projects, such as Caldera Art:

> I see the Green Cauldron as leverage. I know for myself, as a budding product developer, I can use it to my advantage. As it gains momentum, I can say that we are within the scope of AGC and I will not be required to explain myself too much – it promotes itself. (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager)

This section has shown that actors participating in the AGC episode saw working across borders as an opportunity to increase international competitiveness through branding a larger area. They recognised that their own region (speaking generally about LGAs) could not gain such exposure alone. Implicitly, it was also seen that they saw an opportunity to gain assistance from TA and PA as part of the national promotional efforts they were undertaking for the National Landscapes project, suggesting the actors were acting opportunistically as a response to the initiative at the higher scale.

### 8.3 The Importance of Pooling Resources

One of the greatest benefits of collaboration in tourism destination management reported in the literature is the pooling of resources (Butler & Weidenfeld 2011; Dredge et al. 2011a; Leiper 2004; Leiper et al. 2011; Marzano 2008; Watkins & Bell 2002), particularly among small DMOs with limited resources allocated to tourism (Lovelock & Boyd 2006; Naipaul et al. 2009). In support of these calls, some of the actors located in the rural parts of the borderlands recognised an opportunity to collaborate across local and state boundaries to pool resources and create synergies. The CEO of Destination Tweed, for instance, made the point that the budget the organisation receives annually, mainly from the local council, could not be used as productively as when their funds were pooled:
One of the most important things for us is the ability of marketing dollars to tell a story consistently – and that is where the collaboration comes in – to pool resources. We are pretty good at doing that and have numerous networks. (Participant 4, DMO CEO)

When probed further, this Participant made it clear that they would attempt to work collaboratively with their neighbours ‘whether in or out of the State… depending on tourist needs and what opportunities exist to meet those needs’. This showed that minimal concern was given to the State border and more to the tourist experience. It confirms arguments regarding the importance of connecting to the tourist experience and the importance of tourism managers being able to adapt their product offering to constantly changing patterns of demand and competition (Fyall & Leask 2007). The initiator of the RW project directly agreed with this point:

Most of the funding for tourism comes from LGAs and it is fairly common for an LGA to want to work on one project with one or more LGAs to stretch their limited dollar further, whether that is within the State or across the border. (Participant 8, DMO Tourism Officer and Chairperson ARTN)

As well as stating the importance of pooling resources with other regions in the pursuit of visitors, Participant 8 recognised that the situation around borders is ‘not fixed but dynamic in time and space’ (Zimmerbauer 2011: 223). The actor also implicitly perceived the importance of responding to the constant changes in demand and competition through cross-border projects. Such an approach has a similar goal to that of the models of Beritelli et al. (2013) and Blasco et al. (2014), to allow destinations to be more adaptable in responding to changing demand. The actual mode of operation, however, was through projects within the existing political-administrative structure, rather than completely changing the structure, as the authors suggest.

Another actor, who has worked in government tourism agencies on both sides of the State border, and who managed the RW for several years, agreed with this point, but made a delineation regarding which actors saw this opportunity:

In hinterland regions, like the region where the RW exists, it is necessary for LGAs to pool their resources. I would think that the country councils, on both States, were more used to working together and, in particular, having to pool their money. They seemed to understand that with the RW… The same could not be said for the Gold Coast however. (Participant 19, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)
Naipaul et al. (2009: 463-4) make the point that ‘very few studies have been undertaken to explore how neighbouring small destinations with limited products and resources can collaborate in marketing their destinations’. These researchers see the potential of such organisations working collaboratively across borders. Following the line of thinking of the authors, larger, resource-rich regions would see limited benefits in pooling resources with smaller regions with less marketing resources to contribute. This confirms the perspectives that smaller, rural LGAs are more likely to see the pooling of resources as an opportunity, while larger LGAs would not.

Reinforcing the multiple perspectives involved in negotiating borders (Rumford 2012), one actor believed small destinations should pool resources to create synergies. While potentially showing bias as an RTO manager and working in a mainly State Government funded organisation, he defended the view that tourism should be managed by RTOs, justifying this suggestion with the same logic as that behind LGA amalgamations that had occurred in Australia (Bell 2006; Tchera 2007):

The solution is to align the resources of local government with Northern Rivers Tourism, which gains most of its funds through the State Government… [But he acknowledged that] there is a suspicion and, perhaps, a concern among local government that the way that the State Government sees the region as being marketed – certainly in the past and the way that they have gone about it – is not really how local government thinks the region should be marketed. (Participant 16, RTO CEO)

There is little doubt that previous decisions made by RTO managers and state scale tourism agencies influenced trajectories that could make collaboration with actors at higher scales less likely to occur. This is very similar to the way that collaborative efforts between actors have been found to be influenced by negative past experiences, particularly in terms of working with actors considered external to the region (Saxena 2005; Verbole 2000, 2009; Wang 2008a).

All the actors who saw this opportunity referred to resources to be pooled as “money”, “dollars” or “funds”. This suggests that benefits of cross-border collaboration such as joint knowledge, information sharing and innovation (Dredge et al. 2011a; Johnson 2009; Perkmann 2003; Van Gorp 2009) were not recognised as relevant, beneficial or feasible in the border region. While some of the actors were supportive of cross-border projects to share funds, it is unlikely the sector will see the development of ‘cross-border regional innovation systems’ (Tripl 2010: 150) or the growth of ‘learning regions’ (Saxena 2005: 277) in the case study border region in the near future.

---

42 Many LGAs in Australia are significantly under-resourced (Bell 2006).
This section has shown that some of the participants in the research, particularly in rural locations, saw the pooling of resources as an opportunity for CBTM. The fact that participants in other areas did not see this opportunity further supports the argument that different actors hold different perspectives and priorities with regards to CBTM. The section has also found that the actors’ views of resources to be shared were limited to financial resources, limiting potential collaborative outcomes.

8.4 **Maximising Lengths of Stays and Return Visitation**

In the urbanised Gold Coast, numerous actors recognised cross-border tourism as a means for maximising the length of stays of visitors and increasing the amount of return visitors to their LGA. Some actors on the Gold Coast seemed highly focused on the development of new products only within their LGA and on “doing the right thing for their rate payers”, as guided by the objectives of the DMO at the time (Gold Coast Tourism Corporation 2010). One example of this was the point made by an Economic Development Manager at Gold Coast City Council:

> Of course, while you need to justify your time, you can look at the indirect results as well. Tourism is all about getting people to stay in a certain place for longer – which means more jobs and more economic development, more broadly. If by tourists taking a day trip to the Scenic Rim will cause them to extend their stay on the Gold Coast, then that is a benefit. Just because they went elsewhere for a day, if it extends their trip here, it is a benefit. It increases visitation and money into the region. (Participant 3, Economic Development Department Principal Project Manager – Tourism)

A Southern Gold Coast Councillor shared this view that increasing duration of stays by offering experiences outside the region was an opportunity:

> Really, we should all be working together as a catchment rather than each one working on its own issues on its own side of the border. If you can offer more than just beach and accommodation, which is mainly what we offer here, people will stay here longer and spend more money in the broader region – we have the accommodation, so we cannot lose. (Participant 9, Councillor)

Specifically discussing AGC, a State Economic Development Officer at the Gold Coast emphasised the support that the project has garnered in QLD, despite much of AGC being in NSW. This was due to the potential of visitors staying on the Gold Coast being able to do day trips, and in turn, stay longer on the Gold Coast:

> I know that the Gold Coast would definitely benefit as the visitors that utilise that infrastructure will stay on the Gold Coast, and then, a lot of the areas where people
would do their walking do not really have the same kind of infrastructure. They may stay longer because they have more to do, and where is it that they are going to stay? The Gold Coast! (Participant 13, DEEDI Principal Project Officer)

While the actors recognised this as contributing to a “cross-border initiative”, it appears they were primarily interested in opportunistically marketing other tourist products available near the Gold Coast. This point is reinforced by the actions of the Gold Coast Tourism marketing organisation, which has been selective in terms of the boundaries of the Gold Coast region for its promotions. An example of this is the unilateral decision to promote Mount Tamborine as part of the ‘Gold Coast Hinterland’ (Gold Coast Tourism 2013). This is despite Mount Tamborine being located within the boundaries of the Scenic Rim Regional Council (Dredge et al. 2011b).

A unilateral decision to use the tourism products available in other LGAs in Gold Coast promotions (see Section 8.5) appears to show limited interest in genuine collaboration. Such an initiative shows limited awareness of the interdependency of actors (Jamal & Getz 1995), no alignment of purpose (Gibson & Lynch 2007; Morrison et al. 2002), as well as a commitment mainly to one’s own region and one’s own benefit (Watkins & Bell 2002). This short-term view is evidenced by the Gold Coast tourism marketing organisation changing their view of the cross-border RW project. Seeing it first as an important opportunity for the region (EC3 Global 2008), the organisation failed to mention it in more recent strategic documents (EC3 Global 2012).

It was not only on the Gold Coast that this perspective was held, however. One actor in the Northern Rivers region saw encouraging tourists to cross the border as a potential opportunity:

> We recognised that, just because people are going into the Gold Coast, it is very possible that they will also visit NSW and, if they do discover us down here, that may even cause them to extend their trip or to come back to our region again in the future. (Participant 16, RTO CEO)

One of the two Federal actors who participated in the research, who was working in Canberra, and therefore not embedded in the local issues, referred to research that confirmed the perspectives of the actors who saw longer stays and return visitation as an opportunity:

> It’s confirmed by research, return visitors will stay longer if given a reason. If, for example, you were a short-stay domestic visitor that was travelling up to the Gold Coast and staying at the Gold Coast for a couple of nights doing the usual Gold Coast theme park stuff, if you were able to entice them and sell them the message sufficiently to sell something that is bigger and in some way unique that is just outside of the Gold Coast, then, the next time they come back, they will probably
stay a couple of nights on the Gold Coast and then go and do the other regions.

(Participant 22, Federal Agency Assistant Director)

Considering the importance of domestic visitors to the border region and the relatively short length of stay across the three LGAs (average length of stay is three nights, reported in Section 6.1), the goal of lengthening stays seems potentially useful to the entire border region.

The above participants expressed a view that increased diversity of tourism products would be of interest to all tourists – a view that needs to be challenged. Despite recognition in the strategic plans of projects offering certain experiences to specific target markets, such as targeting the RW to “True Travellers” and “Wanderers” (Planning for People 2005) and targeting AGC to the “Experience Seeker” market (Tourism Australia 2008b), it appears that the participants hoped the same tourists who visit mass-market theme parks on the Gold Coast will also have an interest in the natural features offered by the RW and AGC. While targeting specific customers for specific products is considered important, in practice the process is much messier and has the potential to result in numerous confusing branding propositions that do not fit well with developing a strong brand image (King 2002).

Among the participants who recognised the potential for cross-border tourism to impact tourist travel behaviours in terms of extending stays and increasing return visitation, only actors on the Gold Coast, a single actor in Tweed and a federal saw cross-border initiatives as an opportunity for visitors to lengthen their stay or return to the border region. This shows that, while actors in a border region may choose to work collaboratively with actors in the region, the reasons for why each actor does so are not necessarily the same.

8.5 Spreading Tourism Demand Around

Self-drive tourism is important for peripheral regions (Liu, Zhang & Nie 2012), while also being an important tourist activity for domestic and international visitors in a country as expansive as Australia (Prideaux & Carson 2003; Scott 2002). In Australia, it has been found that domestic travellers are increasingly making driving (or touring) a part of their travel experience, as opposed to driving directly from their home to a single tourism destination (Carson & Schmallegger 2011). Due to the nature of self-drive tourism, it is not uncommon for touring routes to exist across several tourism regions and to attract a range of tourists (Prideaux & Carson 2003; Scott 2002). The RW touring route is no different, crossing numerous LGAs and State borders as well as being targeted to a diversity of visitors.

In discussing both the RW and AGC projects, those involved in directing and managing the projects felt that it was important to ensure that tourists travel around the entire region, not just complete day trips from a single location. The Founding Chair of the RW project, who was
employed as a LGA Tourism Officer at the time of initiating the project, explained that an important aim of the project was to ensure that tourists travel around the whole region:

The RW was not about hub and spoke. It was a circuit or a loop, which you could spend a few days on. The mentality of promoting Byron in the Northern Rivers, as NSW Tourism does, and the Gold Coast in SEQ is an issue around here. There are only three roads you can go on to get out to the RW region. If you need to go out there and back every day, there is a limit as to how far you are going to go. One or two small areas get saturated and the rest of the region is forgotten and just misses out. If you can get people out following the RW – one night in Tamborine, one in Beaudesert, another in Kyogle and then over to Casino, the whole area benefits. (Participant 8, DMO Tourism Officer and Chairperson ARTN)

This perspective, of an actor located in a rural part of the border region, is in direct opposition with the views reported in Section 8.4, which explored the belief that cross-border tourism should involve tourists staying in their region for longer, by opportunistically promoting attractions across the border for day trips. Another Northern Rivers actor shared opposition to this view: ‘I think that culture of questioning: “how can we spread the tourism dollar around the region?” seems to have disappeared for some people… I think some areas see that they get a big benefit and others don’t’ (Participant 7, RDA CEO). This Participant further explained:

The whole premise of the RW, for instance, was to really circulate the tourism benefits within our region. That is still a bit of a sore thorn in the sides of many players. One of the challenges that we have in the Northern Rivers is that, while we have these beautiful landscapes, we don’t have a lot of product. (Participant 7, RDA CEO)

The Tourism Development Officer at the Scenic Rim felt that distance, which is also an issue found in other border regions (Ioannides et al. 2006; Lähteenmäki-Smith 2004; Nilsson et al. 2010), increased the importance of capitalising on the opportunity to spread tourism demand:

The biggest struggle that we have out this way, including here in the Scenic Rim and over the border in places like Kyogle, Uki, Casino and even Murwillumbah, is getting people to come out here in the first place. If they are going to just be doing day trips from the coast, we are probably lucky if they even come out as far as Mount Tamborine. Having a driving loop means that the visitors intend to travel around and stay across the region, which is where the dollars are – not in day trips! (Participant 6, Council Tourism Development Officer)
The views of these actors mirror the points in the RW strategic plan written a decade earlier, which noted that the border region offers ‘immense natural attraction [that] is sometimes lost due to the geographical spread of the individual sites. Additionally, the region has suffered from fragmented marketing practices, especially in the lack of cross border cooperative marketing’. It was argued in this plan that, being labelled as ‘The Way to The Rainforests’ (Planning for People 2005: 3), the RW would create the mechanism for demand to be spread more widely and provide an attraction to tourists (Richmond Valley Shire Council 2002: 1).

Despite the recognition of the importance of cross-border collaboration to spread tourism demand throughout the border region, an othering of sorts appeared to be occurring where the rural, inland actors saw the coastal destinations as not sharing the same issues of distance or the difficulty faced in terms of attracting overnight visitors. Given the socially constructed nature of identities and regions (Nilsson et al. 2010; Paasi 1996, 2010), this suggests that a collective border region narrative may not exist among the inland (mainly rural) and coastal (mainly urban) actors, which may make true cross-border collaboration difficult to obtain.

The Chair of AGC, who was the only actor on the Gold Coast to hold a similar perspective to the other actors, felt it was important to encourage visitors and residents to experience the ‘whole’ region:

> You need to have a whole day to go out and see a bit of the landscape. Local residents are always looking for places to go. You could go to a different part of the Green Cauldron every day for the next 40 years. We need to help them do that. We need to spread the demand around. (Participant 20, AGC Chair)

The desire to ‘spread the demand around’ (Participant 20, AGC Chair) aligns directly with the main aim of touring routes ‘to guide visitors through the most attractive parts of a region and to direct them to lesser known areas’ (Mackellar & Derrett 2006: 278-9). While several of the actors saw potential in spreading demand around the region, one actor saw dominant attractions as a concern:

> One of the challenges of the experience development strategy will be to spread the interest away from Mount Warning. It is certainly spectacular, but there is a hell of a lot of other spectacular places around. We need to make sure that we spread it around. It would be easy to just pick a couple of iconic spots, but that is not what we should do. We need to spread it around the region. (Participant 20, AGC Chair)

Two other actors saw the potential for cross-border tourism as an opportunity to spread visitors throughout the border region, but expressed this more in terms of the extent that Northern NSW relies on SEQ. One actor discussed this in the following terms:
I think it is very important, coming back to the border and tourism, that the bigger brother of SEQ should take the smaller brother of Northern NSW under its wing and say: “I can use you, without destroying you. We have the accommodation, but you have some great attractions”. In the broader region, it is obvious that the Gold Coast is a source of tourists for the rest of the region. (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer)

The other actor who shared this view felt that both Northern NSW and the Scenic Rim should be assisted by the relatively resource-rich Gold Coast:

From an ethical perspective, I think that Gold Coast City Council needs to work with and assist the Scenic Rim and Tweed. Particularly for people that live around the border and tourists who go on holiday around the region. (Participant 21, University Engagement Officer)

Essentially, the actors felt that it was a matter of social responsibility for the “larger player” to assist other parts of the border region. The views of these actors provide an insight into the situation of the border region, with Tweed (and much of the rest of the Northern Rivers) and the Scenic Rim being seen as lacking collaborative capacity. As discussed in Section 9.1, such a view suggests that these regions are on the political periphery of their respective States, as has been found to be the case in some international border regions (Buursink 2001; Timothy 2000a). This leads to a feeling of dislocation and deprivation that triggers attempts to find local opportunities (House 1980; Martinez 1994a, 2008).

This section has found that the opportunity to spread tourism demand around the broader region was seen within the context that capitalising on the opportunity could overcome existing problems – the long distances between towns and areas with limited built attractions and accommodation. Through greater collaboration, particularly through touring routes, there was an altruistic perspective held that all regions could benefit from multiple short stays across the broader region.

8.6 Completing the Product

As was explained in Section 3.1, tourism destinations are generally accepted to be regions that people travel to with a view to satisfying their needs as visitors. These needs usually include such components as services, transportation and attractions (Gnoth 2004; Gunn 1994; Selin 1993). Several actors in the case study region referred less to destinations, but more to tourism products – sometimes in reference to specific accommodation providers, attractions or infrastructure and at other times in reference to groupings of tourism organisations across the region. Kotler et al. (2006: 15) define the term product as ‘anything that can be offered to
satisfy a need or want’, which explains why the actors referred to numerous forms of products. Increasing competition and shifts in demand is driving tourism actors to constantly re-invent and renew the tourism experience on offer – usually through the development of new products (Fyall 2010; King 2002; Marzano 2008; Parra-López & Calero-Garcia 2009).

In regards to the theme discussed here, the term product refers to the tourism episodes under study and the opportunity that cross-border tourism offers to ensure that a product is complete, at least from the perspective of those on the supply side of the market. Section 8.1, on the other hand, when discussing products, only referred to physical assets in a region. In each case, cross-border tourism collaboration was seen as a means to ensure that the tourist experiences being developed and promoted were not constrained by the political borders in the region and hence could be considered complete. In the case of the RW, the Project Manager maintained it was an important decision:

To the group, it just made sense to open up and to cross the border. The difficulty still presented itself to try to find a nice clear loop. Prior to crossing the border, this was even more of an issue, in that the roads didn’t really seem to gel at all… It was all about getting the best product available. If that meant going across the border, so be it. (Participant 19, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

Given the importance of roads in self-drive tourism (Liu et al. 2012; Prideaux & Carson 2003; Scott 2002), the actors initially involved in the RW saw the built infrastructure – specifically the region’s roads – as needing to ‘gel’ and considered the only way for this to occur was through cross-border effort. Furthermore, the ‘best product available’ was thought to be possible only through the product crossing the border. In all other cases, it was the natural features that were seen as important in developing the product. Again, in these cases, it was considered the “best” option to develop a product that crossed administrative borders. One actor explained:

In the same vein as the RW, you need to create a footprint to serve a purpose… the purpose of AGC is to showcase the naturally occurring features within a geographical feature that formed more than 20 million years ago through a natural process – when the caldera formed, political borders and humans were not around, so a product that does not cross the border would not provide a true picture of the natural environment. (Participant 8, DMO Tourism Officer and Chairperson ARTN)

Another actor remarked:

What is important is that tourists don’t see those political borders – they just see the landscape. In that way, there is a common element that is presented by the environment that sort of pulls together a region – if we were to continue promoting
a diced-up landscape, it simply does not mean anything to anyone – collaborative effort is a necessity. (Participant 22, Federal Agency Assistant Director)

These arguments are in keeping with the points made in the National Landscapes program policies, which maintain ‘the provision of top class experiences, not places’ is crucial, and therefore focus on “experience boundaries”, not administrative boundaries to provide a more digestible park experience (National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008: 3).

Actors involved in projects in the Coastal Network reported that the Seafood Discovery Trail was based on where there was a product of interest to a certain targeted tourist market. Although the experience being promoted in that case relied primarily on existing restaurants in a high-density area, it was considered the product would not have been complete without the initiative crossing the state border and involving the Tweed River:

The Seafood Discovery Trail was one project where you have the Tweed River and then 12km north and 15km south you’ve got estuaries, rivers and coastal towns. The reason for this was to find a novel thing that tourists could do in the region. We thought it would be better to go that way [across the border, to the south], if you are looking at seafood. I mean, in Palm Beach – the other direction, but within the Gold Coast – there are hardly any restaurants; so you are obviously going to go down the coast. It didn’t have much to do with the border, but rather it was the river. You can’t do a Seafood Discovery Trail in the 12km that we have [within the Southern Gold Coast] – you must make it a bit longer than that. We didn’t see much point in going north, as Palm Beach is only 6km long and it’s got nothing really to offer. It was a common-sense thing to do and not about doing it simply so it would be cross-border. (Participant 5, DMO CEO).

It appears that the perspective of this participant has similarities with the arguments of Beritelli et al. (2013), who assert tourism destinations need to become increasingly flexible across space and time to respond to changes in consumer tastes. Additionally, O’Neill (2008) has argued the importance of allowing tourism actors to work on projects across administrative boundaries to complete tourism products. In this situation, the tourism actors at the Gold Coast, led by CSGC, recognised the potential to respond to demand for a Seafood Trail. It was thought that the demand could be best met by exploiting the opportunity to work across the State border to provide a complete product. A more critical perspective may also come from the conclusion that there was more to this decision, including the pressure placed on CSGC to work across the border with Tweed to achieve the key performance indicators set out for the organisation (Institute of Business Leaders 2009).
In terms of another initiative undertaken by the Coastal Network, a similar point was made by a Tweed actor:

The Wintersun Festival was always a cross-border event. It takes place in Coolangatta and you would have noticed, Coolangatta and Tweed Heads are pretty much the same place. For the event to not cross the border would be ridiculous. The area shares the same streets – surely if it was decided that the event would only run in QLD, it would spill down to the Tweed Heads end of the streets. You simply cannot avoid everything being cross-border around here! (Participant 1, Chamber of Commerce Chairperson)

The point made by this actor was that a tourism product situated directly adjacent to the border would spill over to the other side, whether collaboration takes place or not, but to collaborate across the border would mean providing a complete experience to visitors. In contrast to alienated regions, where the flow of residents and visitors is limited and crossing the border is difficult (Martinez 1994a; Timothy 1999), the requirement to collaborate appears to be a particularly important issue, as visitors have the freedom to cross the border irrespective of whether tourism actors on each side work collaboratively.

This section has made it clear that the participants viewed tourism management as an activity aimed at offering tourism products that fulfil a need, and that the need to create complete experiences provides a key opportunity to work collaboratively across political borders. It was shown the actors spent minimal time questioning whether creating complete experiences was the correct decision – it appeared obvious to them. This does not overcome the issue that ‘generally, visitors will define a destination quite differently from industry or from government agencies’ (Jenkins et al. 2011: 24). While the actors may be collaborating across administrative borders to develop complete products, this does not mean that the products will necessarily connect well with the visitors.

8.7 Aligning with Tourist Perceptions

Section 3.5 made the argument as to the widely-held perspective in the literature, that the way tourists perceive tourism destinations often does not match the political-administrative borders used in the management of tourism destinations (Dredge 1999; Jenkins et al. 2011; Quack 2006; Swarbrooke 2001). Pike and Page (2014: 204) make the point that the supply side perspective is commonly defined ‘by a political border’, while the demand side perspective defines a destination as ‘a geographic space in which a cluster of tourism resources exist’, whether this is a small precinct, a political region or a space that cuts ‘across conventional political boundaries and/or may be located along a touring route’. Numerous actors in the case study border region
recognised the opportunity that exists for cross-border tourism collaboration to better align with the perceived destination. In the context of AGC, one Gold Coast actor explained:

As the Green Cauldron committee realised, the largest centre of population in the region is on the Gold Coast. A lot of people stay here and want to do day trips. They will stay here and won’t see the borders. They will go to Mount Warning for the day or over to Byron for the day. Of course, it can also work in the opposite direction. They have gone to the whole region as a destination. So, I think it is vital that we work across the border to reinforce that view. (Participant 15, Economic Development Department Principle Tourism Officer)

Another actor made the point that tourists look for value, not political borders so offerings have to match this:

When we are developing and marketing tourism, we don’t just look at one region within certain boundaries. Instead, we look at what is available here and in NSW and we look to develop tourism products based on that. We recognise that people might stay in NSW and go to the theme parks, and likewise people might stay here [the Gold Coast] and go and climb Mt Warning… The visitor doesn’t see the border and they are simply looking for value, meaning that it is important that our message matches their expectations. (Participant 3, Economic Development Department Principal Project Manager – Tourism)

The same point was made by Participant 22 (Federal Agency Assistant Director), who claimed that the ‘Experience Seeker market’, which is the target group of AGC (National Landscapes Reference Committee 2008), see the natural boundaries of the region and do not want to feel impeded by differences on each side of the border. This made it more important to make the experience ‘as seamless as possible’. A Northern Rivers actor made the point that the visitors to the region, particularly the domestic self-drive market, which was the focus of the RW, see their destination as numerous villages and attractions in a very large cross-border region:

The way that visitors to this region go about their holiday is that few of them simply stay in one place. Most of them move around and do a combination of things that might cross local or State borders. It is important that we accept this and promote cross-border experiences that match this view (Participant 16, RTO CEO)

These actors, speaking from numerous scales and perspectives, show that tourism planners and managers are not always focused on ‘inappropriate geographical boundaries’ while ‘markets and destinations are interdependent’ (Dredge 1999: 782). Many of the actors recognised that tourists to the border region rarely recognise only one LGA or State as the tourist destination that they are visiting, acknowledging that a cross-border approach to tourism provides an
opportunity to better align to the existing perceptions of visitors, which, as Participant 3 suggested, is a key component to providing excellent customer service and value.

This perspective is supported by one of the few empirical studies that considers how tourists view tourism destinations. It shows tourists do not see tourist destinations as constrained by political-administrative borders (Pearce & Schänzel 2013). Within the case study region, an example of this would include the view that visitors often perceive the Gold Coast and Mt Warning, in the Tweed Shire, as one destination (Participants 3 & 15).

Actors in the Scenic Rim (Participant 10, Councillor) and Kyogle (Participant 23, Council Economic Development Officer), west of Tweed, agreed on the opportunity that is present in terms of viewing and managing tourism as a tourist sees it – as cross-border. They made the point that cross-border roads directly link the towns on each side of the border, meaning that two towns such as Beaudesert, QLD and Kyogle, NSW, ‘are simply part of one journey, whether that is across a State border or not’ (Participant 10, Councillor). One actor went on to explain that ‘out here, you can’t even tell where the border is, apart from if you read up on the Lions Road43 (Participant 23, Council Economic Development Officer). Using the terminology of the literature (Martinez 1994b; Paasi 2002a, 2010), it is apparent that a shared border narrative existed to some extent among these actors, who referred to a sparsely populated rural part of the border region. The same point regarding the location and existence of the border was made in the more densely populated Southern Gold Coast and Tweed Heads region:

We have an MOU with CSGC, which we have had since their inception, and that is basically about the Southern Gold Coast and Tweed Heads pretty much being seen as a single entity in the tourist’s head. Most people don’t see the border unless they are actually standing at the big concrete monolith [see Plate 5.6, on page 102] – which is pretty ugly. The twin towns of Coolangatta and Tweed Heads are seen as a great place to go and the States don’t really come into it – we just aim to provide a great experience. (Participant 4, DMO CEO)

Destination Tweed’s counterpart at CSGC shared this perspective and, thus, saw an important opportunity to work together to maximise the quality of the experience:

The point is whether people coming to the combined region have a good time. Are they getting good service? Do they feel safe? That’s all it’s about – when people go on holiday, they want to have a good time and feel refreshed. That is the challenge for all regions. If someone comes up here and stays here, but travels to Kingscliff, for instance, and gets bad service, that will go against their holiday. I could say,

43 The Lions Road, which formed part of the RW (Derrett et al. 2001), was a road built by the Kyogle and Beaudesert Lions Clubs, with the assistance of local businesses and community members, after the failure of the respective State Governments to directly link the towns (Kyogle Shire Council 2011).
yeah, well, that was in NSW, but I would prefer not to have to say that. I would love to think that anyone staying over the border has the same experience when coming up here. (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

It appeared from the comments of both the rural and coastal local tourism actors that, while tourists see the border region as a single destination (although this is yet to be confirmed by research), the actors also held some form of border narrative, seeing their region as belonging to both their respective State and the border-crossing region. Using the conceptualisation of Paasi (1986, 1991), the border region has some aspects of having a territorial and symbolic shape according to local actors, in a way similar to the Skärgården Swedish-Finish archipelagos, which are marketed and viewed as one region by tourism actors. However, in the latter case, the cross-border region has a much longer history of being a single region in the minds of the local actors (Nilsson et al. 2010).

As predicted by border studies scholars (Herzog 1991; Leimgruber 1989; Martinez 1994b; Timothy & Teye 2004), the opportunity identified among the local actors has resulted in some level of collaborative effort, confirming that they see themselves as a ‘self-directed economic community rather than pure members of a nation-state, whose behaviour must conform to strictly national [or subnational state] norms’ (Martinez 1994a: 13). One example of the decision to work as a border region, as opposed to seeing the state border as a rigid barrier, was shown through promotional materials:

See, here you are. That is a classic piece of cross-border promotion [see Figure 8.2]. Where do we show the border? Look, here we go, Byron Bay there, Tweed Valley up there, and we haven’t put the border in… We also appear in the Tweed Tourism brochure [see Figure 8.3]… Even publications we put together, with our ratepayer’s money, feature the Tweed more prominently than the rest of the Gold Coast! (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

While the Tweed Shire did not use the same cross-border image nor focus only on the coastal region, again, the tourist promotional materials showed national parks in both States and coastal towns in Tweed and the Southern Gold Coast. Furthermore, although directions are given to Lismore and Nimbin in the hinterland of NSW, as well as to Surfers’ Paradise, the map does not mention the key tourist attraction in the Northern Rivers – Byron Bay. Despite the collaborative efforts evident through these materials, Participant 5 (DMO CEO) suggested there were issues in terms of the level at which cross-border collaboration was occurring. An example was the choice to continue promotion in the Tweed Tourism brochure: ‘to be honest, we’ve reduced the size of our ad this year by half’, this was later confirmed via email (Wilson 2011).
This section has shown that actors in subnational border regions may see the alignment of the perceptions and expectations of tourists with the way in which they promote and manage their region as an opportunity to work across borders. It was found that, rather than containing tourism management to \textit{a priori} regions, there was more potential in responding to the way in which tourists see the broader region and their travel patterns. The section has also shown that this was not an enduring perspective and that, with the passing of time, the opportunity was seen as relatively less important for some actors.

Figure 8.2 Promotional Map Focusing on the Southern Gold Coast and Tweed  

![Promotional Map](image)

Source: CSGC (2011)

### 8.8 Conclusion

This chapter contributed an analysis of the opportunities for CBTM in the case study border region. It was the first of two chapters aimed at \textit{synthesising and evaluating the opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM in the subnational border region of South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales} (Research Objective 4). It found that opportunities exist to work collaboratively across subnational borders, both at state and local borders. This finding aligns with the arguments in the international tourism and border studies literature, which promote the importance of cross-border efforts in border regions. Seven key findings were uncovered with regard to CBTM opportunities.

Firstly, most of the themes recognised in the case study border region were centred on demand side definitions of tourism destinations (see Table 8.1). Rather than seeing tourism destinations as \textit{a priori} regions constrained by existing political-administrative boundaries, the actors recognised opportunities to package tourism assets across borders and develop tourism, particularly through promotional material, that were believed to better fit the experiences of...
tourists. This unveiled the insight that subnational actors can see opportunities from ‘marketing-management’ and ‘customer-oriented’ perspectives (Saraniemi and Kylänen 2011: 135-6).

Figure 8.3 Promotional Map Focusing on Mount Warning in Tweed

Secondly, the broader set of opportunities recognised in the international border literature is not necessarily recognised by actors in subnational border regions. The international border region literature has argued that stronger cross-border collaboration has the potential for economic development, innovation and knowledge sharing (Herzog 2014; Johnson 2009; Lundquist & Trippl 2009; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 2013; Perkmann 2003; Perkmann & Sum 2002; Trippl 2010; Van Gorp 2009) and the tourism literature has recognised broader benefits of tourism collaboration in terms of knowledge and information sharing, increasing resilience and dealing with complexity (Dredge et al. 2011a; Wang et al. 2013). It was found that subnational borderlanders might not have such opportunities in mind when partaking in CBTM. The cost of being overly focused on “joining-up” products and tourism experiences is that it limits the extent to which actors develop resilience, new knowledge and innovative management practices.
Thirdly, different opportunities are recognised by different actors when partaking in CBTM in subnational border regions. The multi-perspective nature of CBTM (Lawrence 2009; Paasi 2010; Rumford 2008; Verbole 2000, 2009; Zimmerbauer 2011) means that, while general agreement may exist as to the concept of CBTM in a subnational border region, different actors in different regions may see different opportunities in their participation. In this research, it was found that actors in the urban regions held a stronger interest in using cross-border tourism to maximise the length of stays and return visitation to their region, while rural actors were more interested in working collaboratively to spread tourism demand throughout the broader region. This finding implies that evidence of cross-border collaboration within a subnational border region cannot be seen as a sign that all of the actors view the opportunity in the activities in the same way.

Fourthly, the way in which local actors give meaning to the state border is highly opportunistic and responsive to initiatives at higher scales. Although the higher scales, through their rigid view of the border, create many of the issues that local actors face in border regions, local actors in the subnational border region studied were opportunistic and responsive to initiatives at higher scales. This reinforces the multi-scale nature of CBTM (OECD 2013; Paasi 2010; Skäremo 2016; Timothy & Teye 2004), but puts into question the relevance of the argument in the international literature that borderlanders try to avoid higher scales (Herzog 1991; House 1980; Martinez 1994b). While this may be true when dealing with the barrier effects of borders, in subnational border regions higher scales can offer opportunities particularly through funding. This chapter further supports the observation, made in Chapter 7, that while local actors can be at the heart of CBTM, the actions of these actors can be highly influenced by the policies and political decisions at a particular time and space at higher scales. Given the vertical fiscal imbalance in Australia (OECD 2015), it is argued that cross-border tourism efforts that are not opportunistic and responsive to higher scales are unlikely to succeed.

### Table 8.1 Opportunity Themes in the Case Study Subnational Border Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Previous Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the diversity of tourism experiences</td>
<td>Naipaul et al. (2009); Wang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximising international competitiveness</td>
<td>Naipaul et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooling Resources</td>
<td>Dredge et al. (2011a); Naipaul et al. (2009); Wang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximising Length of Stays and Return Visitation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading tourism demand around</td>
<td>Mackellar and Derrett (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing the product</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning with tourist perceptions</td>
<td>Beritelli (2011); King (2002); Pearce and Schänzel (2013, 2015); Swarbrooke (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Fifthly, opportunities in subnational CBTM can be pursued on a project-based basis. In the case study subnational border region, it was found that CBTM opportunities were pursued on an ad hoc, often organic project basis. While much of the international research on CBTM has focused on the opportunities and challenges of cross-border tourism by considering how government actors in *a priori* regions work collaboratively and integrate with adjacent regions (e.g. Naipaul *et al.* 2009; Skäremo 2016; Wang *et al.* 2013), it has been found in this thesis that cross-border tourism collaboration is not necessarily pursued by entire local governments. Rather, cross-border tourism opportunities can be pursued by networks of individual actors within a range of different types of organisations in a subnational border region, on an informal basis.

Sixthly, the recognition of and decision to pursue CBTM opportunities emerge over time and space. Driven by individuals and personalities, as described in Chapter 7, different actors in the case study border region recognised opportunities from cross-border collaboration at different stages. This aligns with the findings of previous studies, including Jamal and Getz (1995), which have found collaboration is an emergent process. While the episodes held few of the characteristics of true collaboration (Jamal & Getz 1995), this observation contributes the perspective that tourism management across subnational borders changes over time and space, as some actors become more involved and others less. Research that only considers cross-border tourism collaboration at a single point in time would not effectively recognise the emergent nature of such efforts.

Finally, it was found that greater integration of border regions might not be seen as an opportunity in subnational border regions. In the case study region, the opportunities that were seen as holding potential among local actors were primarily focused on ‘marketing-management’ and ‘customer-oriented’ perspectives (Saraniemi & Kylänen 2011: 135-6). While some researchers in the international border studies community, such as Martinez (1994b), see the main aim of cross-border efforts being to completely integrate border regions, the appetite for this in subnational border regions may be limited. Borderlanders may not be able to see beyond the borders that they deal with on a daily basis or they may hold the perspective that such significant structural change to existing borders is unrealistic. Further views on CBTM are dealt with in the following chapter, where the focus moves to the CBTM challenges.
9 CHALLENGES IN THE CENTRAL EAST COAST BORDER REGION

This chapter asks the question: if there are opportunities for CBTM, why is there limited evidence of successful CBTM in the case study border region, in other parts of Australia, and internationally? It is the second of two chapters aimed at synthesising and evaluating the opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM in the subnational border region of South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales. Seven themes regarding CBTM challenges are analysed. The chapter concludes with a synthesis and evaluation of the impediments to CBTM in the case study border region.

9.1 LACK OF PRODUCT

Whereas the most cited opportunity for working across borders in tourism management was to diversify the tourism product (see Section 8.1), the most cited challenge among the participants was a lack of product. This was a point that was made strongly by participants on the more developed Gold Coast; they saw a lack of tourism development in the Scenic Rim and in the Northern Rivers as a challenge to their involvement in CBTM. One Southern Gold Coast participant explained regarding AGC:

You’ve got to promote it by all means. But you do have to be careful. The product that is in there is not what I would call satisfactory. It is not at a satisfactory standard. It takes investment from government, private and semi-government. That’s fine and good luck to them, and it’s happening; but I don’t think that it is going to bring one more tourist into my area. (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

This internally-focused view, while uncovering issues of identity, makes a clear point: the actor did not believe that what was offered by the rural parts of AGC was worthy of visitation and, indeed, his regions would not benefit. This view aligns with views of actors in twin-island nations in the Caribbean, who saw limited interest in collaborative activity between islands due to limited benefits (Cameron 2014). Another Gold Coast actor initially showed a more optimistic perspective of AGC, until she experienced part of the region for herself:

I went to the opening in the Tweed, and then my husband and I decided to go and do something on the cauldron. We couldn’t find what we were looking for, there was mainly dirt road and it was absolutely appalling from an infrastructure perspective. It is extremely important that the local authorities put the required resources in or get grants to put the resources in to develop it. No one is going to say: “I had the greatest time getting bogged on a back road at Uki… I was in the
middle of nowhere and my phone didn’t work and I couldn’t get assistance”. If you come from overseas for that experience, which is who they are marketing it to, well, unless you are bringing your car with you, it is no good. So, when you think about it, it is not really any good for international tourists, as they are not allowed to take rental cars off the sealed road. At the moment, the product doesn’t fit with the vision and that is a big issue. (Participant 9, Councillor)

While this actor aimed her disappointment at the local actors who needed to ‘put the required resources in or get grants’ to do so, another Gold Coast actor was more critical of agencies at higher scales:

Perhaps, instead of Tourism Australia starting out by marketing, it would be better to spend some of the initial funds on doing up the walk ways and other infrastructure. Maybe they need to fix things before they start selling it, otherwise there will be disappointment – it is about balancing priorities. (Participant 15, Economic Development Department Principle Tourism Officer)

Such statements from participants on the Gold Coast imply a lack of shared decision making, engagement and inclusivity, all of which are important aspects of successful collaborative activity (Gibson & Lynch 2007; Gibson et al. 2005; Jamal & Getz 1995; Watkins & Bell 2002). The points made by Participant 15 are reminiscent of studies that have found that one important barrier to cross-border collaboration is the perception that cross-border programs are often too top-down and bureaucratic in nature (Ioannides et al. 2006; Lagiewski & Revelas 2004; OECD 2013). Essentially, the view of this actor was that a tourism agency at the Federal Government scale was directing the project, with minimal concern for issues in the region, which caused the actor to lose interest.

The point that parts of the border region were lacking product was not only a perspective held by actors on the Gold Coast. One Tweed actor explained:

The word-of-mouth thing is important. Over the last 20 years, the Tweed has been seen as the place not to go. I think that a lot of international tourists have gone back to London or New York, for instance, and told people: “Don’t go to the Tweed for rainforests. Go to South-East QLD, or go to Dorrigo, or the Blue Mountains, or somewhere else with the same experience”. You know, if you go to Mount Warning and you can’t get a park[ing space] and there are too few toilets, you just wouldn’t recommend it. You can do all the promotion that you like, but word of mouth is much more important. (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager)
Participant 1 (Chamber of Commerce Chairperson) made the same point in expressing the view ‘there is a great website that TA have put together, but once they get here I think we just need a bit more guts to it’. Another actor from the Northern Rivers made a similar point in discussing AGC and the readiness of many of the regions for large-scale, cross-border tourism projects:

It will be marketed internationally and has huge potential – while it also crosses two States. It is a shared opportunity, but the branding of the region is different across the region. The Gold Coast says: “Come to the coast”, Kyogle says: “Come to the west”, and Tweed says: “Come down to Mount Warning”. We have a lot of brands within a single region, and it’s confusing. We need to settle down and work out who we are and what we are trying to achieve. This area is known for producing milk, soy beans, a university and a few surfies. We don’t produce much more than that and suddenly we are going to be like Kakadu. (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer)

As well as reinforcing the perception that the border region includes many areas that are not very developed in terms of tourism attractions and that are of questionable value to tourists, Participant 14 also made an important point regarding differences in the tourism development and brands in each region, with the positioning of the Northern Rivers in the minds of tourists being quite different to the positioning of the Gold Coast. Studying the Mekong Subregion, Henderson (2001) also found this was a significant barrier to CBTM. When numerous regions across numerous nations attempted to work collaboratively, the issue of each nation having existing brands and tourism offerings caused difficulties. To use the terminology of Herzog and Sohn (2014), rebordering and rebranding the region to encompass multiple regions that had previously been branded separately resulted in the existing brands becoming confused.

An actor in Tweed, NSW felt that infrastructure, including tourism product, was not being adequately maintained and developed in the Northern Rivers. He explained that the reason for this was due to the region’s border location: ‘No one looks at us as a regional centre. That is probably a major issue, simply to keep the infrastructure up to speed’ (Participant 12, Member of State Parliament). The actor explained that dealing with border issues takes significant political will, as very few of his colleagues in the State Government were interested in his border plight. This point relates to the points made in the literature that border regions are often of peripheral political interest (Buursink 2001; Timothy 2000a).

44 This could be part of the reason why the actor has appeared in the media calling for Tweed to become part of Queensland (The Northern Star 2011; Todd 2011b).
The NSW Government’s lack of understanding and interest in the North Rivers region was further evidenced by an actor who brought up the topic of funding:

There’s a classic example about 12 months ago, around this time last year, where, three months before the end of the financial year, National Parks NSW [the State Parks Agency] received a big allocation of funding from Sydney to repair the Mount Warning track. They had three months to do it and if they didn’t do it within three months, the money would disappear. As that was during a really nasty wet season – you know, the draught-breaker – they just lurched from one section of the track to the next. They really didn’t do a very good job at all, due to a lack of resources, the weather and all sorts of crisis. (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager)

Decisions made at higher scales impact upon the differences in tourism development across a border region and, in turn, may act as a barrier to CBTM. A further explanation is the different level of priority that tourism has in different regions. This was explained in the following terms:

One of the issues with these [cross-border] projects is, they cover so many council areas and cross a state border, which means each region has its own level of development, as well as different planning and policy intentions. In the RW, some regions were anti-tourism, for instance. But, for example, Murwillumbah [in inland Tweed] may be pro-development and willing to subdivide every piece of their land, and they don’t give a flying fuck about tourism – they want manufacturers. And that is smack bang in the middle of the RW! (Participant 15, Economic Development Department Principle Tourism Officer)

Another actor made a similar point in explaining that ‘some places are more rural councils who are primarily concerned with roads and rubbish’ (Participant 16, RTO CEO). An elected official in the Scenic Rim, when asked about the RW, explained:

As a smaller council, there is only so much funds that we can provide for things like signage and other tourism infrastructure. Not to mention, we get our money from ratepayers and not everyone in the Scenic Rim is in tourism and benefits from tourism. There is only so much that all our primary producers are going to benefit from us spending ratepayer funds on signage and the like. (Participant 10, Councillor)

This section has shown that a major challenge to CBTM is the perception among actors, informed by a dominant view of mass-market tourism and views that built tourism attractions are paramount for tourism, that some regions are not worthy of collaboration, as they lack attractions and infrastructure to promote to tourists. This has been shown to result from three
underlying challenges: actors in different regions, particularly local government actors, have different priorities regarding tourism; State Governments hold differing priorities; and some regions have a relatively limited “collaborative capacity” in terms of what their region is perceived to be able to offer.

9.2 CONTRADICTORY DIRECTION OF ACTORS

Paasi (2010: 2297, 9) argues that ‘regions condition and are conditioned by politics, culture, economics, governance, and power relations’ that occur ‘both inside and outside the regional process […] with scale-crossing complexity’. In the same vein, Chen’s (2005) work on regions in Asia emphasised that border regions involve social actors who are influenced and influence processes at various scales. In the case study border region, the contrary direction of the various actors was seen as a challenge to cross-border processes. This took two forms – contradiction between organisations at a single scale, and contradiction between scales.

9.2.1 CONTRADICTORY DIRECTION OF ACTORS AT THE SAME SCALE

As was argued in Section 3.5.1, CBTM can be characterised as a wicked problem involving multiple actors with diverse goals, often with limited consensus. In the case study region, this was a challenge to stronger collaborative activity. An important example of this tension was observed in the Coastal Network, where the core of the region was centred on the neighbouring towns of Coolangatta and Tweed Heads, and cross-border efforts between the two economic development organisations on the Southern Gold Coast and in Tweed. One actor explained the differences between the two organisations:

Destination Tweed is entirely about tourism. It’s like Tweed Shire Council has said: “We are just going to cut you off and give you a little bucket of money, and all you are going to be is the tourism unit”. Gold Coast City Council, on the other hand, is a huge council. They are still doing tourism, but they also realise that the Southern Gold Coast is its own beast. While the Southern Gold Coast has a strong tourism agenda, it also has a broader focus and is structured very differently from Destination Tweed. It is funded on levies from business and the local Councillor. There is also very strong reporting back to council. It is about building business and remaining viable. Destination Tweed does not have such a strong link between their activity and accountability to the community. (Participant 21, University Engagement Officer)

45 A testament to the cross-border narrative in the region is a large club and resort named Twin Towns Clubs and Resorts, located directly on the border (Twin Towns 2014).
Another actor, who had worked at Destination Tweed, shared the challenge of two quite different organisations attempting to work collaboratively:

They [CSGC] are in a very difficult situation, as they report to the economic development organisation and are driven very hard to show economic benefits and financial gains for everything they do. That is, without the understanding that many of these projects can take a fair few years to develop and provide those outcomes… We did not have to answer to council as much. We did reports and had regular meetings, but that was about it. CSGC was set up as a new thing and it was being funded by the ratepayers, or levies, so they had to be really careful with what they were doing with their money. Destination Tweed is very amicable and not a stressful environment. I get the feeling that the CSGC is more stressful. (Participant 18, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

The points made by these actors accentuate the differences between two organisations at a similar scale. The organisations were seen to operate quite differently, holding contradictory values and cultures. While CSGC was seen as being under considerable pressure to show short-term economic gains, the Tweed organisation was seen to be ‘very amicable and not a stressful environment’, with some projects possibly taking ‘a fair few years’ (Participant 18, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager). The contrary situation can be seen in the point made by the CEO of the organisation: ‘I’m just saying that I will go where I can get the quickest, best traction, and my board feels the same way’ (Participant 5, DMO CEO).

Gibson and Lynch (2007) show that contradictory value sets among actors are an important factor in tourism networks lacking strong ties and limited collaborative outcomes. Contradictory priorities in terms of tourism objectives and the timelines that different organisations work on have also been shown to be an important factor in the breakdown of cross-border collaborative efforts in numerous contexts (Lagiewski & Revelas 2004; Lovelock & Boyd 2006; Studzieniecki & Mazurek 2007; Timothy & Teye 2004). The RW project, which covered multiple LGAs, shows how the challenge grows when more than two organisations are involved. Participant 15 (Economic Development Department Principle Tourism Officer) discussed this in terms of some local councils having different expectations of tourism initiatives:

For instance, we had some councils that were looking for outcomes within the next 12 months, and others who were happy to see results years into the future. They also had different expectations about what they would see coming out of a project. Some of the smaller councils were happy to see any number of new tourists, while
others justified initiatives on specific figures – some of the figures were pretty unrealistic.

Extending on the findings in Chapter 6, that different LGAs can have quite different views of tourism, this section has found that differing perceptions of project outcomes among actors can be a challenge to CBTM. This means that a lack of clear objective setting and a lack of agreement on resource requirements in CBTM efforts can become challenges to project progress and success.

9.2.2 CONTRADICTORY DIRECTION OF ACTORS AT DIFFERENT SCALES

While CBTM is said to often begin at the individual and local scale (Timothy & Teye 2004), in most contexts it also involves other scales. This is why Verbole (1999, 2000, 2003, 2009) has described regional tourism management as a negotiated process that involves various scales. The actors in the case study region made this point when considering the challenge of dealing with higher scales. A Tweed actor, for instance, explained:

> We have a memorandum of understanding with CSGC, which we have had since their inception, and that is basically about the Southern Gold Coast and Tweed Heads pretty much being seen as a single entity in the tourist’s head. Most people don’t see the border, unless they are standing at the big concrete monolith [see Plate 5.6, on page 102]… The twin towns of Coolangatta and Tweed are seen as a great place to go and the States don’t really come into it. It is at the state level that all the bullshit, crap goes on… (Participant 4, DMO CEO)

As well as a memorandum of understanding between CSGC and Destination Tweed, as was explained in Section 7.4, one of the core objectives set for CSGC from its inception was the expectation that the organisation work with Tweed actors to develop a ‘sustainable tourism industry’ (Institute of Business Leaders 2009: 15). Despite such agreements and objectives at the local scale, the issues surrounding the Wintersun Festival (and then Cooly Rocks On) provide an example of the ways in which the contradictory direction of actors at different scales can impact the success of CBTM. Initially, this was seen in the decision by the NSW Government to report that they had “won” a QLD event that would be run in NSW (discussed in more detail in Section 7.4.2), prompting the State Member for Tweed to say that ‘our area has been absolutely sold out and ignored, which has led to us becoming a victim of cross-border issues’ (Potts 2010b: 3). The fact that organisations at higher scales can hold different meanings of the border is a clear challenge to CBTM, with actors on one side of the border feeling neglected by their own agency, and the actors on the other side confused about the intentions of their counterparts:
We replaced Wintersun, which has been happening for 25 years, but we have had all of these conflicting statements and perspectives from south of the border. That’s fine, they can make whatever statements they like, but we are not going to stop Cooly Rocks On… But I just think that it’s unfortunate and unnecessary that they all haven’t got together and done their homework. Obviously, they haven’t been talking to each other, because my Council says to me: “We don’t mind it being a cross-border festival. Yeah, bloody oath, good for us, good for them”. They don’t seem to see it in quite the same way, which is very sad. (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

The actor went on to explain that ‘when I provide assurance to my board and then they see the media, it leaves me very red-faced and in the bad books! It causes me and my board to think very seriously about getting involved with the south again’ (Participant 5, DMO CEO). This provides evidence that, despite a strong feeling of connection between Tweed and Southern Gold Coast actors (see Section 6.2), contradictory decisions made by other scales can impact the collaborative activity in the border region. In broad terms, one QLD actor suggested that the Tweed Shire requires state assistance to work on cross-border projects, but does not generally receive it:

Tweed is responsible for this borderline that it inherited, and is now supposed to solve all its problems. I don’t know that the border is a Tweed or Gold Coast issue – it’s a state issue. Poor old little Tweed has a tiny little constituent and it is trying to overcome the impact on the broader region, but those other stakeholders are not there to assist with that solution. That is a roundabout way of saying that, I think, cross-border cooperation can occur, but it has not been thought about well at all levels. (Participant 21, University Engagement Officer)

An NSW actor involved in the RW felt there was collaboration, but blamed a lack of funds for limited success:

The cooperation is there and it exists – the project is a great concept for linking tourists to the rainforest, but it requires more money. (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer)

A QLD actor discussed the importance of state assistance in successful projects and the lack of support that most areas in Northern NSW receive:

It all comes back to the assistance that they get from their state and, basically, they don’t have the resources to support projects in the same way. (Participant 11, RTO Destination Management Officer)
The actors were very much aware of the argument, made by Jonas (2006: 401), that ‘to say that something significant is happening at a particular “scale” (e.g. the “metropolitan”) is not necessarily saying that it is that particular “scale” that decides’. In the context of the episodes under study, there were significantly different meanings of the border evident among agencies both between and within the State Governments. For instance, within the same state, while the NSW tourism agency incentivised a cross-border project away from the border region, the same government employed a Cross-Border Commissioner, who aimed to work towards removing border issues in the state (see Section 6.2.1.2). One actor provided an example of how differences in State Government priorities were also a challenge to cross-border tourism initiatives:

You might find, for instance, that one State Government will say: “Let’s fix that road”, while the other side won’t even have it on the radar. It’s uncommon for there to be Federal funding for that sort of thing. This is particularly an issue for some tourism initiatives, like the RW, where half of the road is developed and the other half is gravel. (Participant 3, Economic Development Department Principal Project Manager – Tourism)

Another actor noted that state agencies can have preconceived perceptions of regions and often have a very clear view, driven by state tourism policy, that a tourism project should be contained within state borders. In terms of AGC:

One of the issues that we came up against was because Mt Warning was in Tweed, it was seen as a NSW project, as opposed to cross-border. In saying that, Mt Barney, even Burleigh Heads, is outflow from the volcano. So, there is a lot of geological footprint on both sides of the border. So, it has taken us a while to work with that – the perception that the region was only on one side of the border was certainly held by QLD State. (Participant 18, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

In the cases of both the RW and AGC, it was reported that, because the largest section of the project region was in one State, there was a view that the project belonged to NSW and not QLD, meaning that it lacked support from QLD State agencies. This is the opposite situation to the Cooly Rocks On festival, which the NSW State Government and tourism agency saw as a QLD event. These situations reinforce the liminality borderlanders deal with as ‘halfway populations […] caught within intervening space between normative frames of reference’ (Gelbman & Timothy 2011: 113). Cross-border projects in the case study region need to be constantly negotiated with higher scales of government on both sides of the border to gain recognition and support, but this is not always forthcoming.
One solution to the contradictory direction of scales recognised by the actors involved in AGC was the establishment of RDA committees\(^{46}\) by the Federal Government, which, among other things, assisted communities to develop infrastructure and services (RDA 2012). One actor explained:

**Working with the RDA is fantastic. Their whole job is around crossing borders and that sort of thing. I have already had discussions with Scott [the then CEO of RDA Gold Coast], and he has already earmarked AGC as the highest priority under a particular funding round that will be coming up… I guess, before RDA came on board, we were a little bit hesitant as we did go for some funding in the past – a T-QUAL Grant\(^{47}\) – and it got knocked back. Basically, it was very competitive, but then people started questioning if it would be supported by the States. As the RDA is there now, you would hope that it would be supported. Not to mention it is a Tourism Australia initiative and they are both federal agencies (Participant 11, RTO Destination Management Officer)**

This line of thinking suggests that the AGC actors had the intention of avoiding the states or at least placing more focus on dealing with one scale over another. There was also a belief that this action would be favourable, given the project was already aligned with another federal agency. Unfortunately for the actors, the change of government at the federal scale in 2013 saw the end of both T-QUAL (Austrade 2016) and Regional Development Australia Fund grants (Australian Local Government Association 2013), as well as a scaling back of the role of RDAs.

This section has found that contradictory directions and views of actions, driven by differing meanings of borders, can be a key challenge to CBTM. It also found that meanings of the border did not only differ between the State Governments, but also between agencies within the same State. The section has also extended the findings of Chapter 7, that CBTM is not only challenged by changes in broad policy decisions, but also by changes in the meanings of borders among actors at different scales.

---

\(^{46}\) RDAs are a network of 55 committees of local citizens, established by the Federal Government in 2010 to support the development of Australia’s regions (Buultjens, Ambrosoli & Dollery 2012; RDA 2014). As well as the committees, a Regional Development Australia Fund was established. RDAs assisted proponents to apply for funds and prioritised applications, prior to evaluation by the Federal Government. Grants were available up to a maximum of $25 million (Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development 2016b).

\(^{47}\) T-QUAL Strategic Tourism Investment Grants (STIG) offered matching ‘funding of up to $1 million […] to eligible nationally significant and innovative tourism projects aimed at developing Indigenous tourism, economic development and/or tourism employment’. Eight projects were funded under the program, all of which were concluded by the 2014-15 financial year (Austrade 2016).
9.3 Identity and Othering

As was posited in Section 1.1, no region is ever without some form of bordering processes (Herzog & Sohn 2014; Newman & Paasi 1998). Such bordering processes can have bridging as well as barrier effects (O’Dowd 2001). One source of rebordering and barrier effects seen in the case study border region was identity and othering. The views of the participants showed both explicit and implicit signs that this was also an important aspect of the extent to which they were involved in cross-border tourism.

An actor on the Gold Coast, the most developed part of the border region (see Section 6.1.1), had a very clear perspective regarding more rural regions; targeting an LGA in the Northern Rivers:

You can go to Kyogle, but it’s a back-in-time journey. You drive to Kyogle – fair enough – wild pig country out there, especially the roads out there. I don’t know. It’s too far. The people who come to holiday here aren’t going to go there. I’ll say they won’t go any further than a 45 minute drive when staying at the Gold Coast. They are just as likely to travel to Springbrook, which is an hour-and-a-half. To go off into the wilds of all of that… I don’t think so. (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

An actor in the Northern Rivers expressed his perspective of the Gold Coast, which, in a way, agreed with that of the Gold Coast actor:

When looking at the Gold Coast and Tweed, and then to Kyogle and Beaudesert, I think there are some major philosophical perspective differences and marketing differences between the Gold Coast and Northern NSW. These differences are not as significant in the Scenic Rim. The Gold Coast is all high-rises, while the Northern Rivers is a region of villages. From a tourism perspective, the public that visit the Gold Coast are not the same people who visit the Northern Rivers. (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer)

Each of these actors had a clear perspective of how they perceived the other region, agreeing that the tourists that visit certain regions are unlikely to be attracted to certain other regions. This point has an important barrier effect regarding the extent to which actors in the regions would see potential cross-border tourism projects as beneficial. A Tweed actor who saw cross-border projects as important explained that the issue of othering among the hinterland actors in his LGA was a significant issue he had to deal with:

Interestingly, throughout the Northern Rivers and South-East Queensland (which includes the Gold Coast and the Scenic Rim), there was a discourse that promoted the significance of villages for the respective regions (Dredge et al. 2011b; Institute of Business Leaders 2009; Northern Rivers Regional Strategy Secretariat 2001; QLD Department of Infrastructure and Planning 2009; Tweed Economic Development Corporation Ltd 2007; Wilson 2011).
I have had some stand-up fights with some community people because they keep saying: ‘We don’t want to be like the Gold Coast’. The Tweed is never ever going to be like the Gold Coast – never ever. The planning restrictions would not allow the same type of development here. (Participant 4, DMO CEO)

Tweed Shire Councillor van Lieshout was quoted in at least one source, speaking for the local government, saying: ‘We have a vision for the Tweed and we want to make it quite distinct from the Gold Coast’ (Simpson 2011: 2). Another actor in the Tweed shared similar concerns regarding the influence of the Gold Coast on the region:

This is where a sense of identity comes into it. For the last 20 or 30 years, there have not been any individuals or groups who have been powerful enough to say: “Let’s stick with the Tweed as having a sense of identity that is different to Lismore, or the Gold Coast definitely”. But, there has been far too many pressures from the Gold Coast, which have caused the Tweed to be diluted. (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager)

In the international border region literature, much of the focus on identity and othering has been on the cultural sensitivities and language barriers that exist between nations (e.g. Ioannides et al. 2006; Saint-Germain 1995; Scott 1998; Scott & Collins 1997; Timothy 1995, 2000b). The points expressed by these actors suggest that cultural divisions in a border region also exist in the case study subnational border region, but in terms of the focus that each region has on tourism development, perceptions of the type of tourists that they attract and the influence that the regions have on one another.

A similar situation appeared to exist in the twin-island nations studied by Cameron (2014), where cross-border collaboration was limited due to the risk of one island’s image being spoiled by association. Even within NSW, there was significant jockeying for position among the Northern Rivers LGAs. According to Participant 8 (DMO Tourism Officer and Chairperson ARTN), simply starting the conversation among certain LGAs while establishing the RW was difficult, as some regions saw themselves as distinct from the rest of the Northern Rivers region – particularly Byron Bay. Another Northern Rivers actor made a few points regarding the differences in tourism across the region, implicitly stating his own othering:

Some places are more rural councils who are primarily concerned with roads and rubbish. The Clarence and the Tweed probably are the most mature regions in terms of tourism management and having some resources to go out and promote themselves, making them easier to work with (Participant 16, RTO CEO)
While the discussion so far in this section has led to the line of reasoning that identity and othering has only had an excluding effect on the participants and completely challenged CBTM, the concept of identity also requires affiliation, whether with a supranational state, a nation, subnational state, region or any other group of actors (Lebow 2013). There did appear to be affiliations outside of existing political borders in two particular regions. The first was in the rural areas, such as the Scenic Rim, to the exclusion of more urbanised regions:

When you stand back and look at it, we have a lot more in common with those areas over the border than we have with our neighbours within QLD – you know, the Gold Coast, Ipswich and Logan. We’re more rural; like Kyogle and Murwillumbah [inland Tweed] to a certain extent. (Participant 10, Councillor)

An actor in the Northern Rivers also made this point:

When looking at the Gold Coast and Tweed, and then to Kyogle and Beaudesert, I think there are some major philosophical perspective differences and marketing differences between the Gold Coast and Northern NSW, but these differences are not as significant in the Scenic Rim. (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer)

The identities and othering among actors were not aligned only with the state border. Other borders – in this case, the border separating the urbanised parts of the Tweed and the relatively developed Gold Coast – were considered to be separate from the rural areas, and were sometimes referred to by the actors as the hinterland. This common identity could be partially explained by the actors perceiving themselves as dealing with similar problems as the other hinterland actors, which are not necessarily the same for the other actors. The issue of dealing with challenges and complexity in the environment has been found to be an important driver of collaborative activity (Gray 1989; Jamal & Getz 1995; Wang 2008b; Wang & Fesenmaier 2007). Participant 18 (Cross-border Tourism Project Manager) explained that the original intention for the RW was for the touring route to be completely in the hinterland, due to the existing ties in the region and common challenges, but the actors found that they could not attract State support without ties to the more urban regions. The identity divisions between rural/hinterland actors and those on the coast shed light on the dynamics of tourism management in an exurban space, which is an area of the literature that has received limited attention (Weaver 2005).
The second form of border-crossing identity was in the Coastal Network region centred on the neighbouring towns\(^{49}\) of Coolangatta and Tweed Heads. Several participants (mainly those located very close to the vicinity of the border, on the coast) appeared to share a common identity, at least to some extent. One participant explained:

> I think the cold hard reality of it is, if you want an honest opinion, the Tweed and the Southern Gold Coast are interconnected and are considered, at least by the population, as one anyway. I can tell you, I go and shop at the Tweed and people come up here and shop. It’s happening all the time. Everyone knows that Tweed Heads exists and everyone knows where the M1 [cross-border motorway] goes. (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

As with the hinterland actors, a possible reason for this border-crossing affiliation may be that the actors share similar issues as a result of their location. Nonetheless, some participants on the Southern Gold Coast still had clear affiliations with the rest of the Gold Coast, supporting the point that actors often have numerous affiliations (Lebow 2013). The common identity of the neighbouring towns also had a detrimental impact on the extent to which the hinterland actors in the Tweed were willing to work collaboratively with the actors focused on promoting mainly Tweed Heads and the Tweed Coast (Participant 19, Tourism Officer).

Detailed analysis of the various identities within the case study border region made it possible to map where the regional identities existed (see Figure 9.1). It shows that, at the time of the research, while the focus of some local actors remained primarily within state borders, others held affiliations with local actors across political borders. Indeed, the identities held by the actors appeared to hold strong parallels with those found at the Mexico-USA border by Martinez (2008), who discussed national and transnational borderlanders in that region (see Section 2.2). In this case study, some participants (e.g. those identifying with the rural borderlanders) reflected a trans-state perspective of holding numerous links and building bridges across the state border, with other, more state-focused, borderlanders having limited interest in working across the border (e.g. those who identified with the Gold Coast).

This section has made the important observation that challenges can exist at all types of borders. While this thesis had the initial aim of studying the challenges of CBTM across a state border, these findings suggest that local government borders and psychological borders can have barrier effects that are just as important. It also found that identity can result in a further challenge related to trust in and concerns about the other.

\(^{49}\) According to the analysis of Buursink (2001), to refer to such border towns using other labels is misleading: other terms, such as “sister cities”, presume that the towns/cities are identical, which is inaccurate.
Section 9.2 discussed the challenge of differing directions of organisations, both at the same scale and at different scales. Aside from the alignment of strategies, a significant challenge to cross-border project sustainability reported by participants was the basic issue of individuals. One actor reported their own experience of working with a range of actors on cross-border projects:

I think it is less about the organisation and more about the individual, and as to whether they are willing to lead their organisation into that process or not. Organisations can change their approach with a change in staff – it can move from very strong and positive relationships to one that is terrible. (Participant 21, University Engagement Officer)

Another actor explained the reverse of this process occurred with respect to the RW:

The project was held back in QLD by the Tourism Officer at the Gold Coast. He was attending the RW meetings and corresponding with the group, but I later found out that he never passed any of the information on to the tourism department that he was working in and never gained any funding or support from the council, because they didn’t know about the project. (Participant 19, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)
The participants explained that, as soon as someone else took up the position, the project was accepted at multiple scales in QLD and more collaborative work began. Another actor involved in the RW discussed the ingrained attitudes in the Northern Rivers region, making it a challenge to establish a common direction among the individuals directly involved in tourism in each LGA:

At the local government level, someone always wants to be at the top of the tree. Lismore is the business hub for this region. Ballina is growing as a coastal resort and Byron thinks that they are the top of the Himalayas and are the pinnacle of everything. So, trying to get those three in the one room speaking to each other on a level playing field is pretty tricky. Often, the success of these programs is not really gained at that political level, you need to get it, but it is the tourism people who need to get it first. (Participant 8, DMO Tourism Officer and Chairperson ARTN)

A Project Manager within the RW project also discussed the challenge of aligning personal values among actors, where poor alignment has the potential to hinder a project. Specifically, if the personal values of someone who holds a critical role in the longevity of a project do not align with the aims of the project, this can be a significant issue for the project:

This is where you need to know the people. The Industry and Investment [NSW State Agency] person we have here – based in Lismore – is very much interested in sustainability and the environment. The guy from Tweed Heads, however, is far less approachable. I mean, there is no way that I would have got funding for Caldera Art through him. Basically, his vision is about what the immediate jobs are going to be. (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager)

The personalities and relationships among individuals, especially among local government officials, have been found to be a barrier to cross-border collaboration internationally. Gordon (2007: 73; 2009), for instance, states that, at the local scale, ‘the greatest obstacles toward cooperation may continue to be ingrained attitudes of local government officials’. Tosun et al. (2005) claim that the unwillingness of politicians is an important factor in the success of cross-border projects at the national scale. Furthermore, the overall issue of personalities impacting CBTM is supported by a case study of local tourism in Southern New Zealand, where the researchers concluded the lack of successful collaboration resulted primarily from ‘local politics and personalities’ (Lovelock & Boyd 2006: 156).
A further challenge relating to individual personalities was the importance of individuals leading cross-border projects with conviction. Recognising that individuals can make the difference between a successful CBTME and a project that fails, one actor was willing to make a significant personal sacrifice to ensure AGC was established as a National Landscape project:

> You can develop the engagement, the networks, and the buy-in, but mood is very difficult to sustain. As soon as the project loses focus and there is no champion of the project, it is doomed to failure. A good example of this is, when I left Tweed Tourism, I stayed on as the Chair of the National Landscape Project [AGC], just to get it over the line. I essentially said at the launch that I just couldn’t do it anymore.

(Participant 19, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

Participant 20 (AGC Chair) also made the point that he recognises that long-term, cross-border projects need individuals who are willing to lead a group over a long period of time. He explained that he was willing to make AGC a ‘life’s work, as it takes strong individuals to develop something worthwhile’. Champions have been recognised in existing research on networks as an important catalyst to collaborative projects (Gibson & Lynch 2007; Gibson et al. 2005; Morrison et al. 2004). The perspectives gleaned from the case of AGC also support the model developed by Wang (2008a, 2008b), which recognises leadership as an important motivator for actors remaining involved in collaborative efforts. In addition to individual personalities and their relationships, a lack of effective leadership in CBTMEs is a significant challenge to project sustainability.

This section confirms the importance of individuals that has been previously argued in the literature, but has also recognised the challenge that arises when a region has limited social capital. It has shown that regions with limited social capital may be challenged in terms of their collaborative capacity, while the extent to which individuals buy-in into cross-border projects can be further challenged by the level of trust held among individual actors.
9.5 DOMINATION OF SHORT-TERM THINKING

One of the key features of effective regional collaboration involves actors holding a long-term perspective and long-term planning (OECD 2013; Watkins & Bell 2002). At the time of the study, however, it appeared that, short-term thinking dominated many of the CBTMEs. Participant 18 (Cross-border Tourism Project Manager) explained the situation in terms of miscalculating what would be involved in the Seafood Discovery Trail:

These things get very messy. We put money in, and they put money in. A consultant was paid to go to all the premises. We collected a lot of information from the divers and the restaurants, and some suppliers. We got the print run done, then, there was insufficient funding. The idea was for a consultant to go and sell the idea to businesses in the twin towns for advertising revenue. They could then be incorporated into the brochures. It was a good idea, but there was not enough funding put in from either side to be able to do that. (Participant 18, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

This example shows that the parties involved in the project lacked commitment to the project or were unsure what the project would involve. Potentially, it could have been impacted by CSG having limitations on the time period within which projects needed to show results:

They are also in a very difficult situation, as they report to the [Gold Coast City Council] economic development organisation and are driven very hard to show economic benefits and financial gains for everything they do. That is, without the understanding that many of these projects can take a fair few years to develop and provide those outcomes. (Participant 18, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

An example of the short-term thinking that dominated CSG was again seen in discussion of AGC:

To be honest with you, that won’t ever develop in my lifetime – it needs infrastructure and capital investment – it needs roads, it needs more product in it. I don’t know how that project is going to attract the government and private investment needed to put it in the place that everybody is visioning at. (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

The actor suggested that higher scales of government would have limited interest in funding infrastructure for a project with a long-term return on investment. In common with the findings of Herzog (1991) and Martinez (1994a, 1994b), many of the actors felt frustration due to the short-term thinking at higher scales. This was the view of one of the actors in the case study...
region, who was having difficulty getting the NSW Government to take a long-term perspective within his region:

I am trying to get some long-term plans to get a link between here, in Tweed Heads, and Murwillumbah. Unfortunately, because I can’t get these plans, I cannot stop all these new houses being built in the way. The biggest frustration I have is that there is no forward planning with most things – everything is ad hoc and driven by the budget of today, as well as election cycles. (Participant 12, Member of State Parliament)

The view of Participant 12 suggested that, in addition to a lack of funding and support, the NSW Government was making decisions impacting the border region that local actors had little say in. This is partly a result of the lack of power that local councils have in Australia (Dredge et al. 2011a). A government official made the point that short-term planning ‘hurts everybody… I think that tourism, in particular, requires long-term thinking. I am a bit worried that tourism plans, even at very higher scales, only go for four years, especially when the industry is so vulnerable to external shocks’ (Participant 14, State Government Agency Community Engagement Officer). Participant 20 (AGC Chair) acknowledged that there were barriers to taking a long-term project like AGC, but reasoned:

It has taken a very long time for the landscape to evolve and it is there on a plate for us. Certainly, without some funding, it’s going to not have the impact that was probably expected. In saying that, I think it is such a good concept, I will be happy to spend the next 20 years working on it – it is a gift. It’s a good concept and you’ve got to be patient. You must prioritise, but you do need to have tangible steps.

Business longevity was a further issue that was impacting the long-term sustainability of CBTM. Participant 19 (Cross-border Tourism Project Manager) explained that ‘it is very difficult to get business operators to make a long-term commitment, as they rarely intend to stay within the business for more than five years’. This perspective supports studies that have found that tourism businesses often lack interest and motivation in collaboration, whether it is within or across borders (Buhalis & Cooper 1998; Butler & Weidenfeld 2011; Erkus-Öztürk 2009).

This section has shown that, while many of the participants viewed CBTM as requiring a long-term perspective, efforts were challenged by either a lack of effective project management, which could also be the result of distrust among the actors, and the domination of short-term thinking at the higher scales that provided funding and tourist data.
9.6 UNDER-REPRESENTATION IN DETERMINING NEW BOUNDARIES

The boundaries of the CBTMEs were coloured by a range of perspectives on where cross-border tourism experiences start and finish. The AGC experience boundary, discussed initially in Section 7.3, was an example of a point on which disagreements had arisen in terms of the reach of the boundary. One actor suggested that this was an ongoing issue for the region:

One of the biggest issues we have with the Green Cauldron, and it was also an issue with the RW, is working out which locations the experience includes – what it encapsulates. At the moment, the ‘Green Cauldron’ is too NSW-focused and misses important aspects of the geography of the region. I think people forget that there are more extinct volcanoes than just Mount Warning. This means that I have to… the Scenic Rim has to push for the Green Cauldron project region to be extended to include the whole experience. (Participant 6, Council Tourism Development Officer)

Another actor, from a different LGA across the border, expressed a different perspective:

What commonly occurs is that TA has some information that they wish to promote internationally and sends that through to us. It was my job to send that information out to the committee. This was sent out to the committee and the Indigenous people for their approval. In that process, you had quite a lot of – not arguments – but some regions felt that they were not being sufficiently promoted or included. (Participant 18, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

These insights explained the ongoing changes in the experience boundary of AGC over time and confirm the point made in the initial consulting report on AGC (TRC Tourism 2011). The experience boundary becoming larger to the northwest coincided with the QLD local council amalgamations (see Figure 7.3, on page 136). This means that, rather than the experience boundary being a true representation of tourist perceptions of the cross-border region, in the way that Pearce and Schänzel (2013) found tourists experience the ski fields in their New Zealand case study, the boundary had been established through a new bordering process among the actors. This means that the boundary better represented the outcome of a social process of rebordering (Newman & Paasi 1998; Zimmerbauer 2011), based on the actors acting in their own interests to gain the most benefit for their own region. Such bordering processes were seen in reflections such as this one, discussing the RW:

The local council guys were not terribly concerned about who is involved in a project – as long as they got their recognition in the collateral, they had their say and their area was fairly represented, they were pretty happy. (Participant 19, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)
When asked to probe deeper into the formation of the AGC experience boundary, a participant made the following point:

Most of the lead agencies that have the money and have the strength to push it forward are actually sitting in Tweed and on the Gold Coast. Those agencies are really engaged because they have the money and the resources; but the actual true experience of the Green Cauldron sits up in the hills and the hinterland area. There is a push and pull that is going to go on as we try to determine exactly what it is.

(Participant 22, Federal Agency Assistant Director)

Considering the work on bordering processes, it is not surprising that the actors had their own region’s interests in mind and were concerned primarily with having their region represented. Beritelli et al. (2013) describe the process of DMO negotiation as egocentric, with each DMO jostling for its own position in the reordered region. This means the focus is removed from the tourist experience (as discussed in Chapter 8) and placed on the views and perspectives of the tourism actors within a region. This is particularly well expressed in the discussion of AGC:

A lot of the international market already knew the Gold Coast and Byron Bay, so we positioned AGC between those two areas. Because the international market had to know immediately where we were talking about. Beaudesert, now Scenic Rim, felt that they have been neglected in that process, and probably still do now, but there was no point in us going to the world in saying: “Visit the Scenic Rim”. It meant nothing to the international market. You needed a hook or an anchor for them to know where it is.

(Participant 18, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

The concerns of some actors that their region may not be satisfactorily included in future tourism initiatives in the border region may have a reasonable basis:

You have the coastal strip – Surfers, Broadbeach, the Southern end and then the hinterland. I suppose, when you see the brochures and the promotions, it is very much about the beach and the sun, and the hinterland people feel they have been unloved and reasonably left out of that process.

(Participant 15, Economic Development Department Principle Tourism Officer)

This section has made the observation that CBTM can be challenged by strong feelings of distrust among border region actors. Some participants held the view that it was important for their region to be fairly represented and that in some cases, this had not happened. A further underlying challenge to this issue was unclear project objectives and limited shared purpose among the actors, who held a stronger view of ensuring that their region was fairly represented in any efforts, as opposed to the entire border region benefitting by capitalising on the opportunities recognised in Chapter 8.
9.7 **Justification for the Use of Funds Outside of One’s Own Region**

The Australian Government (2015b: 8) has acknowledged that ‘individual jurisdictions face reduced incentives to prioritise projects where benefits spill across borders’. In the case study episodes, this was discussed by many of the actors. One actor made a broad point in the following terms:

I mean Tourism QLD funding does not go across the border – it stops at the border.
Gold Coast City Council also stops at the border. It’s the same for Gold Coast Tourism. (Participant 2, Chamber of Commerce President)

Most of the other actors made similar points, not only about gaining funding from their own State Government, but also from the State Government across the border. Issues that were brought up frequently concerned the RW and AGC. Some actors explained that tourism was not the only issue, with the associated issue of infrastructure also being a concern. Participant 4 (DMO CEO) explained there was ‘recognition by the QLD Government that a bypass was needed at the southern part of the Gold Coast, which crossed the state border. Unfortunately, there was a lot of argy bargy over whether the NSW Government would provide funding for a piece of infrastructure that would benefit both sides of the border’. This kind of thinking supports the point made by the Australian Government (2015b: 8) about the lack of financial support from State Governments ‘where benefits spill across borders’.

Border regions can be far from the political core of individual states. In a federal democracy like Australia, there is little provision for adequate representation or assistance at the periphery; voices in the borderland are unlikely to be heard. This explains why separation movements have existed in locations like Northern QLD and New England in NSW (Lewis 2005; Murphy 2005; Taylor 2006; Totaro 2003): constituents feel they are not listened to. The border region is not politically important to either the elected officials or, by extension, the public service at the State scale. Elected officials are driven by the needs of the *majority* of their constituents; realistically, due to the low population density of the subnational border region, its inhabitants are not well represented in State Government decision making. This argument is supported by the findings of Gordon (2007, 2009), who studied a number of elected officials in the USA and discovered they were unwilling to spend public funds on cross-border initiatives, in case this had negative consequences for their constituents and, in turn, their re-election hopes.

Numerous actors also provided examples of local councils not showing willingness to fund the RW and AGC initiatives. One such example is contained in the following testimony:
The guy who was working in the tourism office at the Gold Coast City Council was more than willing to be involved in the project. They allowed for signs to be erected, but couldn’t really do much more than that. For instance, they didn’t provide any funding like the other councils did. They were happy to put in time, but not dollars. (Participant 19, Cross-border Tourism Project Manager)

Another example came from someone who organised a food festival on the Gold Coast:

We were doing a food festival at the Gold Coast, and I thought it made sense to ‘go to the party’ to work with the Scenic Rim, which was already doing that sort of thing. Unfortunately, my bosses were just like: ‘No, why would you want to play with them?’ I questioned why we wouldn’t – they are our food bowl. I knew that most of the people that came to the region stayed in the Gold Coast, so I couldn’t see any harm in working with the Scenic Rim – if people wanted to travel there, it would have been just another thing to do while in the region. People, a lot of the time, can’t see outside of their own little lunch box and don’t want to spend money on things that might spill over to other areas. (Participant 15, Economic Development Department Principle Tourism Officer)

These examples show that actors within Gold Coast City Council viewed the border as a barrier. Of course, such views were not limited to just the Gold Coast. As was discussed in Section 7.4.2, following the NSW Government’s success in luring the manager of the Wintersun Festival to another part of the State, Tweed Council offered funding for the replacement festival, on the condition that the funding would only be spent on the southern side of the border. The Gold Coast City Council, however, provided funding for the event, irrespective of where it was spent geographically. It seems that the difference in terms of that project may have been that the event had ‘always been seen as a cross-border event, that mostly benefits the Southern Gold Coast’ (Participant 5, DMO CEO) or simply that meanings of the border changed over time.

Reflecting on the projects that the Coastal Network CBTME had undertaken, Participant 5 (DMO CEO) provided insight into his explanation of why funding may not be forthcoming for cross-border initiatives in the future:

We have a very simple little region here, and we have to be careful not to get distracted with our limited resources. We need to make sure we don’t move too far away from our core business, which is to brand and promote this region mainly for tourism. An important part of getting people to move here is also to keep tourists coming, as a lot of the people who move here come here first on holiday. As a business owner in the region, I cannot see why someone would want me, in my position, to attract tourists to the Tweed.
This study revealed that while the State Governments saw the border region as politically unimportant, there was an element of this perspective at the Gold Coast City Council as well. With a relatively large ratepayer base (see Section 6.1.1), and many ratepayers not being impacted by border issues, the policy of the council seemed to be that, unless there was a significant benefit to the Gold Coast, with limited spill over benefits, there was only low-level interest in funding a project. One actor discussed this in terms of an art initiative closely aligned to the RW and AGC:

So, the Gold Coast was pretty much: “No, we don’t really have what you need”. We wanted a thousand dollars and an art gallery space for a touring exhibition. As soon as they found out that our head office was in Murwillumbah, in NSW, it was done and dusted. They explained that ‘we only provide funding to organisations that have their core activity in the Gold Coast’ – that is their policy. We also faced that in Ballina. Kyogle and Boonah [now Scenic Rim] were cool, even though they have limited funds. (Participant 17, Regional Art Project Manager)

As the actor explained, despite the Gold Coast and Ballina having relatively broader ratepayer bases and funds for tourism, it was the smaller local councils, like Kyogle and the Scenic Rim that were willing to provide financial and in-kind support to the project, whereas the larger locations were not.

This section has shown that, while differences in collaborative capacity can be a challenge to CBTM, different views on borders are also a significant challenge. Even when regions have considerable collaborative capacity, some actors in the region can see borders as rigid barriers beyond which their region’s money and effort does not extend. Furthermore, the section has shown that these border meanings can fluctuate, with borders seen as barriers at some times, but not at others.

9.8 Uneven Financial Input and Commitment

A final challenge to CBTM was the question of input from each actor and how (un)even the input was. While regions with a large ratepayer base – particularly, in this case, the Gold Coast – had a significant annual tourism-related budget, other regions had limited capacity to contribute towards cross-border projects. This point was made by Participant 21 (University Engagement Officer), who was involved in the Coastal Network and AGC:

It’s like the elephant in the room. You cannot come to the table to discuss cross-border initiatives if one group comes to the meeting with $100,000 and the other comes with $1,000. This is clearly something that needs to be discussed early in the process. There are issues of equity that are not related to the regions being richer or
poorer, but rather related to the demographics of the population, the resources, the rates paid. It’s very, very different. If anything is going to move forward, this difference in playing field needs to be considered early. Everyone needs to be on the same page.

Other actors recognised that this was, indeed, the ‘elephant in the room’, with certain players holding significantly more resources and potential to drive AGC. One actor discussed the problem in terms of ‘the majority of the lead agencies, who have the money and the strength to push it forward’, being situated on the coast, not actually in the hinterland, where the core of the AGC experience lies (Participant 22, Federal Agency Assistant Director). The actor went on to share her experiences in other Australian border regions:

In the Alpine Region, I have heard things like: “Yeah, but we need to have equal representation of Victoria and NSW”. That is the mindset that they operate in on an ongoing basis.

One actor predominantly involved in the Coastal Network exemplified this line of thinking as follows:

Cooly Rocks On has received support from both sides. Mind you, it has received significantly more funds from this side of the border and most of the activities are on this side of the border. The beneficiaries are the accommodation providers, and they are on both sides of the border, so I don’t really understand why the funding is not split evenly (Participant 9, Councillor)

Participant 18 (Cross-border Tourism Project Manager) explained they were less inclined to work with regions that did not have similar funding structures to their own: ‘Kyogle and the Scenic Rim are also out there, but they don’t really have much money’. While there has been attention in the literature on the impact of differing socio-economic situations on each side of international borders (Buursink 2001; Cameron 2014; Henderson 2001; Timothy 2000a; Timothy & Teye 2004), in the case study border region, the differences are better explained by differing “collaborative capacity” of local councils.

Other actors were less concerned with uneven funding, but rather held concerns about wasted effort in working on projects to which other actors were not making a reasonable contribution. Discussing the failures in the Coastal Network, one actor explained:

What I am here to tell you is that we’re organised. We have our shit together and we know what we want to do. It is not in our ratepayer’s best interest to have my time and my resources, and my salary, being spent on wheel spinning exercises
with anyone – be it the Tweed or anywhere else. I think we are much better off just doing our own thing. (Participant 5, DMO CEO)

Another actor, in discussing AGC, acknowledged the frustration that projects can have for actors when working across borders:

If we are not getting support from over the border, we must ask the question as to why we are even bothering with these sorts of initiatives. At the end of the day, if we are finding it too hard and inefficient, the question then arises, maybe we should have just done the project by ourselves… I think a lot of places would very much have this question. I know that a lot of energy has been put into projects that cross the border around here, and I can assure you that it has taken its toll. (Participant 11, RTO Destination Management Officer)

This section has shown that differences in collaborative capacity between local councils can be a significant challenge to CBTM, with some participants unwilling to work with counterparts that could not provide equal input. The concern that actors may not “hold up their end of the bargain” was found to be resulting from underlying challenges related to ingrained distrust among the actors and poorly established project objectives, due to the highly organic nature of the projects.

9.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter, following the analysis in Chapter 8, considered the challenges limiting the success of CBTM in the case study border region. In other words, it set out to further investigate the “border issues” and “border anomalies” found in previous Australian tourism studies (Jackson & Murphy 2002; Lade 2006b, 2010; Smith 2005, 2011). It aimed to synthesise and evaluate the opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM in the subnational border region of South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales. Eight key findings were made.

Firstly, many of the themes uncovered in the case study subnational border region were shared with previous studies of international border regions (see Table 9.1). Exceptions to this were issues that would be expected to be more common in international situations, such as difficulties for tourists to cross borders (Gupta & Dada 2011; Studzieniecki & Mazurek 2007), histories of conflict and war (Henderson 2001; SAYA 2012; Tosun et al. 2005), and limitations of international treaties (Timothy 1999). A further theme not previously recognised in the literature was concern about local government regions being under-represented in determining the boundaries of new cross-border initiatives.
Table 9.1 Challenge Themes in the Case Study Border Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Previous Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of product</td>
<td>Buursink (2001); Cameron (2014); Henderson (2001); Nguyen (2014); Nguyen and Pearce (2015); Timothy (2000b); Timothy and Teye (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictory direction of actors at the same scale</td>
<td>Cameron (2014); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004); Lovelock and Boyd (2006); Naipaul et al. (2009); Studzieniecki and Mazurek (2007); Timothy and Teye (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictory direction of actors at different scales</td>
<td>Herzog (1991); House (1980); Martinez (1994b); Verbole (1999, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity and othering</td>
<td>Ioannides et al. (2006); Lagiewski and Revelas (2004); Nilsson et al. (2010); Skäremo (2016); Timothy (1995, 2000b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual personalities and their relationships</td>
<td>Lovelock and Boyd (2006); Tosun et al. (2005); Wang et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domination of short-term thinking</td>
<td>Macchiavelli (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for the use of funds outside of one’s own region</td>
<td>Gordon (2009); OECD (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneven financial input and commitment</td>
<td>Jamal and Getz (1995); Lade (2006b, 2010); Wang (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-representation in determining new boundaries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.

Secondly, challenges to CBTM exist at all types of borders. In the case study region, while the state border proved to be a significant challenge, and created numerous border issues uncovered in Chapter 6, local and other mental borders featured strongly. This finding supports other research that has found a range of challenges at this scale (Gordon 2007, 2009; Lovelock & Boyd 2006; Wang et al. 2013). It underscores that, while state borders may be important in understanding the challenges involved in subnational CBTM, other subnational boundaries cannot be overlooked in research on state border regions. Furthermore, work on regional identities (e.g. Lebow 2013; Paasi 1996, 2009) cannot be ignored in studying CBTM in subnational border regions, as this thesis has found that mental borders exist, not only at political-administrative borders, but also between actors across and within such borders. There was a clear divide between actors in areas where actors identified as either rural or urban.

Thirdly, different local governments can have significantly different levels of collaborative capacity. While international case studies have found that some organisations lack the resources required for effective collaboration (e.g. Pechlaner et al. 2002; Tosun et al. 2005), this chapter found that organisations in subnational border regions might have differing levels of assets and infrastructure (or “products”) to offer tourists, as well as differing resources (funds, as well as social and intellectual capital) to participate in CBTM. It was found that, in the Australian context, local governments vary significantly, partly due to differences in the way local councils were established in each state at the time (i.e. QLD had larger, amalgamated local councils,
while NSW had smaller councils), and partly due to differences in the ratepayer base between urban and rural councils. This can be a significant challenge to CBTM in subnational border regions, as it can create power imbalances and cause actors to question whether cross-border collaboration is worthwhile. This is a situation that has been found elsewhere, including in counties in Central Florida (Wang et al. 2013) and between Denmark and Sweden in the Øresund Region (Skäremo 2016), where existing structures created power imbalances that challenged the effectiveness of CBTM collaboration.

Fourthly, CBTM in subnational border regions can face ingrained distrust of other actors. It was found in Chapter 8 that, among the opportunities that actors saw in CBTM, some were driven by the self-interest of the actors and attempts to capitalise on assets outside of “their” region to gain benefits. Evaluation of the case study subnational border regions shows that actors in the cross-border episodes were concerned about “their” region being under-represented, actors providing uneven input and spending “their” funds across borders. This is a significant challenge as trust of actors has been found to be an important factor in effective collaboration (Jamal & Getz 1995; Watkins & Bell 2002). It also aligns with the research conducted by Paasi (1996: 80) in the Baltic region, which found that some actors were suspicious of working with Finns, who were perceived as using ‘unscrupulous efforts to consider only Finnish interests’. This finding further aligns with numerous studies of collaboration in tourism that have found trust to be a barrier to effective collaboration among tourism actors (see Table 3.3, on page 36).

Fifthly, local actors and local governments in subnational border regions can have different priorities and perspectives regarding tourism. Building on the finding, made in Chapter 6, that different regions within a subnational border region can offer different tourism experiences and tourism can have a different level of importance to each region, this chapter has contributed the finding that these different priorities and perspectives can be a challenge to CBTM in subnational border regions. This is a finding that has also been made in New Zealand (Lovelock & Boyd 2006) and twin-island Caribbean nations (Cameron 2014), where tourism was recognised as having differing importance between locations on each side of a border. In locations with a high level of diversity, such as the case study region, this challenge would be expected to be particularly significant, whereas in regions where tourism is highly important across adjacent regions, this would be less of an issue.

Sixthly, cross-border collaboration in subnational border regions can be challenged by different meanings of the border among different actors. In the case study border region, while some actors at the local scale perceived the political-administrative borders as fluid, actors at both this scale and higher scales (particularly State Government agencies) held different perceptions of the same borders, seeing them as rigid and standing in the way of cross-border government
funding. While networks of actors at the local scale may attempt to initiate CBTM across subnational border regions, other local actors and State Government actors can be important gatekeepers in blocking support for cross-border efforts. This means that subnational border regions can share similarities to international border regions, where initiatives have been found to be driven by local actors, who hold an interest in working across borders, but the ultimate success of initiatives is influenced by decisions made by actors at higher scales, who often hold different meanings of borders (OECD 2013). In the Australian context, where State Governments have moved to increasingly shift responsibility down to local councils, without also providing higher resourcing (Beer 2006; Bell 2006; Dredge et al. 2011a), this challenge is particularly prominent.

Seventhly, meanings of borders change over time and space, meaning that support can be short-lived. The chapter found that meanings of borders are not fixed, supporting the arguments of Zimmerbauer (2011: 213), who claims borders ‘are constantly being reproduced in various social practices’. This thesis has highlighted, while higher scales can at times see border regions as fluid spaces, requiring and worthy of support, a significant challenge to CBTM in subnational border regions is that support, usually in the form of funding, can often be fleeting. This is linked to the constant shifts in decision-making and changes of policy at all scales of government, which impact all tourism destinations. The challenge is particularly significant in border regions, however, as local actors need to deal with the additional complexity of working in a liminal space intersected by multiple political structures and sets of scales (Timothy 2001; Timothy & Teye 2004). This thesis has contributed the perspective that actors in a subnational border region may face the challenge of negotiating situations where one State Government holds a fluid border perspective, while another government at the same scale holds the opposite perspective, only to find that, with the passing of time, positions may shift.

Finally, the organic nature of cross-border projects may be creating challenges for successful CBTM in subnational border regions. In the case study border region, there was little clarity regarding the ultimate objective of specific cross-border efforts; roles and responsibilities were unclear, milestones were not effectively set and projects not effectively evaluated. Previous research has posited the importance of setting the expectations of actors at the beginning of collaborative activities, particularly to ensure there is a shared purpose and resource requirements are clearly articulated (Gibson & Lynch 2007; Gibson et al. 2005; Gibson 2014). If member actors are not clear on expectations and have limited commitment to CBTM projects, given the often-complex context of subnational border regions, the sustainability of such efforts is likely to be severely challenged. Furthermore, without effectively setting objectives, evaluation of CBTM projects in subnational border regions becomes difficult, resulting in
limited learning from past efforts and poor tourism destination management outcomes (Beritelli et al. 2013).

The findings of this chapter, combined with the findings in the preceding chapters, provides the basis for drawing overall conclusions regarding subnational border regions, including recommending how CBTM outcomes can be improved. This is the aim of the following chapter.
10 Conclusions and Recommendations

This thesis is situated within the expanding discourse around the impacts of growing globalisation and time-space compression. An increasingly common view within this discourse is that individual regions and consumer tastes are becoming more and more homogenous (Agnew 2001), and the world increasingly borderless (Anderson et al. 1995; Giddens & Hutton 2000; Ohmae 1995). The opposing view, advocated in this thesis, is that unique regions interact with global forces through a process of glocalism (Harmsworth 2000) and that borders are still important, but exist in a fluid state, where the meanings of new and existing boundaries constantly change through social processes (Newman & Paasi 1998).

In this global context, it was argued that regions adjacent to borders are an important area of research, due to the benefits that exist for cross-border collaboration. Such benefits extend to tourism management, with the literature recognising a range of opportunities for greater collaboration across borders. Despite the opportunities, actors face a range of challenges dealing with the complexities of working across borders. In the EU, the European Commission has provided significant support to cross-border efforts, but border regions are still described as ‘regions on paper’ but not ‘regions in social practice’ (Paasi 2002b: 98).

Furthermore, research on cross-border collaboration remains limited, and significantly more investigation is needed, particularly in terms of conceptualising border regions (Newman 2006b) and considering a broad diversity of border regions, each within their own socially constructed narrative (Herzog & Sohn 2014; Newman & Paasi 1998). In the tourism literature, borders have received even less attention from scholars, with Timothy (2000b: 120) positing that ‘cross-border management has been virtually ignored by tourism scholars’. Of the few studies that have been conducted, most analysed international border regions within Europe and North America. It was posited that, if the role of borders in tourism has not been sufficiently investigated, subnational borders have received even less research attention.

In the Australian context, case studies had previously found that borders negatively influenced the way in which tourism was managed in regions adjacent to them (Jackson & Murphy 2002; Lade 2006b, 2010; Smith 2005, 2011), but that no further understanding of these challenges existed. While cross-border tourism projects were known to exist in Australia, it was not well understood how the border-crossing nature of the projects impacted the extent to which they succeeded or failed. This also meant it was not possible to improve the success of such projects.

The present thesis has made a significant and unique contribution to our understanding. This has been achieved by addressing the following research aim:
To identify, analyse and evaluate the opportunities and challenges for tourism management across subnational political borders in Australia and to make recommendations to improve cross-border tourism management into the future.

This chapter addresses the key findings associated with each of the five research objectives, overviewed in Table 10.1 (this table includes Research Objective 5, which is discussed in Section 10.6). This is followed by a discussion of the significance of the research. The chapter concludes by considering the limitations of the study and avenues for future research.

10.1 **APPRAISING THE INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE**

Chapters 2 and 3 addressed Research Objective 1, to explore the issues associated with CBTM at an international scale and appraise their relevance in managing tourism in Australian subnational border regions. Chapter 2 began by considering the concept of border regions, which is at the core of the thesis.

10.1.1 **APPRAISING THE CROSS-BORDER COLLABORATION LITERATURE**

Through a synthesis and evaluation of the international literature on border regions, Chapter 2 established the following set of key characteristics.

- Border regions are areas where economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity to a political boundary.
- Border regions are in a constant state of flux that social actors help influence at a variety of scales, both within and outside of the border region, which in turn results in border processes and narratives.
- Border regions exist in proximity of either national or subnational political boundaries.
- Border regions are heterogeneous and cannot be understood as ‘primordial but rather situational and contextual’ (Newman & Paasi 1998: 79).

Consideration of the different contexts (mainly Europe and North America) on which border research has focused shows that, despite efforts to work collaboratively across international borders, various challenges impacted the success of these cross-border efforts. Three key challenges were shown to exist: differing political-administrative systems between nations, identity and ‘othering’ between groups, and holding an economically and politically peripheral location in the minds of those not impacted by proximity to a border. It was established that, while these characteristics may have some influence on cross-border efforts in Australia, it would be difficult to confirm this without further evidence and analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Key Supporting Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RO1: Explore the issues associated with CBTM at an international scale and appraise their relevance to Australia</strong></td>
<td>• Border regions are areas where economic and social life is directly impacted by proximity to a border; they are in a constant state of flux and are situational and contextual. • The literature on tourism management in border regions is limited and challenges are known to exist. • Tourism management in subnational borders is poorly understood, especially in the unique case of Australia.</td>
<td>Hills &amp; Cairncross 2011; Naipaul et al. 2009; Newman &amp; Paasi 1998; Paasi 2002b; Pisani et al. 2009; Sofield 2006; Timothy 2000b; Zimmerbrauer 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RO2: Develop a conceptual framework and research approach</strong></td>
<td>• Tourism management in border regions is a wicked problem that exists in negotiated liminal spaces. • A socially constructionist approach is appropriate in studying CBTM as it acknowledges messiness and connectedness. • Analysis through crystallisation and abductive reasoning is a useful means for studying CBTM.</td>
<td>Dredge &amp; Hales 2010a, 2010b; Ellingson 2009; Penecky 2010; Phi et al. 2010; Reichertz 2010; Timothy 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RO3: Critically examine the South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context</strong></td>
<td>• Subnational borders are messier than previously acknowledged in the literature. • Multiple political-administrative borders can coexist and are constantly changing. • Adjacent regions can be different, but share opportunities. • Higher scales are aware of border issues, but efforts to overcome them are piecemeal and have limited impact. • Cross-border projects change over time and space. • Local governments play a leading role in CBTM, but are highly reliant on funding and tourism data provided by higher scales.</td>
<td>Buursink 2001; Gelbman and Keinan 2007; Herzog &amp; Sohn 2014; Law 2004, 2007; Lovelock and Boyd 2006; OECD 2013; Paasi 2010, 2002b; Rumford 2012; Wang et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RO4: Synthesise and evaluate the opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM in the subnational border region</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong> • Dominated by ‘marketing-management’ and ‘customer-oriented’ perspectives, rather than learning and knowledge. • Different actors recognise different opportunities. • Local actors are opportunistic to initiatives at higher scales. • Different actors recognise and pursue CBTM opportunities at different times and across different spaces. • Local actors do not necessarily see greater integration of subnational border regions as an opportunity.</td>
<td>Dredge et al. 2011a; Naipaul et al. 2009; Rumford 2008; Saraniemi and Kylänne 2011; Skäremo 2016; Timothy &amp; Teye 2004; Verbole 2000, 2009; Wang et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RO5: Provide recommendations regarding how to manage the opportunities and challenges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong> • Challenges to CBTM exist at all types of borders, including functional and social boundaries. • Local governments have differing levels of collaborative capacity. • Actors can face ingrained distrust and othering. • Multiple priorities and perspectives on tourism exist. • Views on borders change over time and space, resulting in support that can be short-lived. • The organic nature of cross-border projects challenges CBTM success.</td>
<td>Beritelli et al. 2013; Dredge et al. 2011a; Lebow 2013; Paasi 1996, 2009; Pääl &amp; Trillo-Santamaría 2014; Skäremo 2016; Timothy &amp; Teye 2004; Timothy 2001; Wang et al. 2013; Zimmerbrauer 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RO6: Ensure the successful delivery of cross-border tourism management initiatives</strong></td>
<td>• Use best practice principles to improve cross-border tourism project management. • Establish Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism to encourage ongoing discourse among border region councils. • Improve government support of cross-border regions through improved funding mechanisms and the provision of more informative tourism data.</td>
<td>Gibson &amp; Lynch 2007; Kelly, Dollery &amp; Grant 2009; OECD 2013; Øresunds Committee 2014; Ramsland &amp; Dollery 2011; Watkins &amp; Bell 2002; Wang et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Developed for this research

**Note:** *Research Objective 5 is discussed in Section 10.6*
10.1.2 APPRAISING THE CROSS-BORDER TOURISM MANAGEMENT LITERATURE

Chapter 3 continued to address Objective 1, by exploring the literature on CBTM. The chapter made seven key findings related to the existing cross-border tourism management literature.

Firstly, while tourism destinations can be defined in multiple ways, there is a tendency for them to be managed through a priori political-administrative borders. Numerous definitions of tourism destinations exist. It has also been acknowledged that tourism destinations, both near and far from borders, are not fixed spaces, but rather are negotiated and dynamic. Nevertheless, tourism destinations across much of the world continue to be defined and managed using political units at various scales, while tourists rarely see tourism destinations as constrained by the borders used by governments (Pearce & Schänzel 2013, 2015).

Secondly, collaboration in tourism management is considered important, but is more the exception than the rule. The literature has called for greater collaboration in tourism destination management, calling it either important (Dredge et al. 2011a) or a necessity (Leiper et al. 2011) for effective regional tourism destination management. Past studies have found that significant barriers to collaboration exist among all actor types in many tourism destinations. While the key aim of collaborative tourism management is to work in a long-term, consensus-driven way, all too often the existing limitations mean that much work is at best cooperative, often being characterised by low commitment and short-term projects.

Thirdly, while tourists may not always travel to border regions for their border characteristics, tourism management in border regions is intrinsically more complex than tourism management in other areas. Although many tourists are attracted to border regions due to their border features, some tourists are attracted to them for other qualities of the region. Irrespective of why tourists travel to a border region, it has been established that tourism management in border regions is also more complex due to the location of the destination in a liminal space intersected by multiple political structures and sets of scales (Timothy 2001; Timothy & Teye 2004).

Fourthly, despite the benefits of managing tourism across borders, the international literature is limited and has found that significant challenges exist. Despite the potential opportunities of CBTM, the number of political boundaries existing globally and the number of calls for further research (Gupta & Dada 2011; Haugland et al. 2011; Naipaul et al. 2009; Sofield 2006; Timothy 2000b), the literature on management of tourism in border regions is limited. Of the research that does exist, most is focused on international borders. The small number of studies on CBTM found that cross-border efforts at international borders have faced significant challenges.
Fifthly, border regions are poorly understood, and subnational border regions even more so. In both the tourism and border literature, it has been acknowledged that subnational borders, while important to understand, have been virtually ignored by scholars (Newman & Paasi 1998; Strihan 2008), particularly in Australia (Pisani et al. 2009). This is despite arguments that, even in relatively homogenous contexts, subnational political boundaries can be centres for higher levels of conflict and frustration (Buursink 2001). It was argued subnational border regions are an important area of investigation.

Sixthly, Australian subnational borders are known to have created issues for cross-border tourism management, but have not been the subject of investigation. A limited number of studies have found that “border issues” and “border anomalies” have impacted the success of tourism management in Australian subnational border regions. Without research into the challenges that exist, it is not possible to improve the success of such cross-border efforts.

Finally, cross-border tourism management in Australian subnational border regions operates in a unique political-administrative context, which cannot be explained by the international literature and has been completely ignored by researchers.

Overall, it was concluded that, while state borders in Australia impact tourism efforts in border regions, no study has considered exactly what these impacts are or has reflected on the important question of how tourism management in Australia’s border regions can be improved. The present study makes a significant contribution to the existing knowledge by investigating the unique context of Australia. It is among the first studies to investigate tourism management in a subnational border region.

10.2 DEVELOPMENT OF A RESEARCH APPROACH

Chapter 4 addressed Research Objective 2, which was to develop a conceptual framework and research approach to explore tourism management in border regions that acknowledges the complexity of CBTM. Building on the literature reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3, the chapter contributed a conceptual framework and research approach that would guide the research, and responded to the call for further conceptualisation of borders and border regions (Newman 2006a). It was shown that no existing framework was capable of understanding the issues of concern in the study, and that it was necessary to develop one.

Chapter 4 established that border regions are negotiated liminal spaces existing within a unique context and situation. More specifically, tourism management in border regions was conceptualised as a wicked problem. Such a perspective recognised that CBTM in subnational border regions exists in a ‘world that is mainly messy’, and rather than trying to make ‘the world clean and neat’ (Law 2004; 2007: 595), this thesis developed a research approach
that embraced the “messiness”, with the aim of overcoming the weaknesses and flaws of existing frameworks that have produced “black spots” in our understanding.

A social constructionist perspective was accepted as the over-arching paradigm of the research, as it allowed for empathetic understanding of multiple realities and human agency, while considering the formation of phenomena and processes in a social context. Acceptance of this paradigm was further justified, as border regions are negotiated spaces where multiple realities and perspectives coexist. A socially constructionist approach acknowledges messiness, and such an approach is more ‘critical, situated and emic’ than other approaches. Finally, the approach allowed for a more complete account of ‘the connectedness of things, places, and people’ (Pernecky 2010: 2) in the border region.

A qualitative, embedded case study approach was developed, allowing for multiple perspectives to be considered within the context and situation of an Australian subnational border region. The analysis of actors at multiple scales within different CBTMEs within the border region allowed for deeper insights into the processes and relations involved in CBTM. This approach also allowed the researcher to investigate CBTM over time and space – as efforts began and changed. Very few studies have considered the CBTM process across time and space, even though CBTM does not exist at only one point in time or in a single bounded space.

The use of multiple sources of data – including a variety of secondary materials, semi-structured interviews and participant observation – and the use of crystallisation of the data provided thick descriptions, complexly rendered interpretations and reflected multiple perspectives. This meant a more complete picture of CBTM was possible. The overall contribution of the research was also enhanced by the abductive approach to analysis. This approach allowed for multiple perspectives to be recognised, while enhancing understanding of the complexity of CBTM, by interrogating the tourism episodes, as well as the existing literature.

While much of the existing literature has studied CBTM as a static concept at a single point in time and space, and often at a single scale, this research has contributed a conceptual framework and research approach that investigates cross-border tourism phenomena as the messy and fluid phenomena that they are. Rather than focusing on border regions and actors in border regions as the unit of analysis, this research is among the first to specifically focus on cross-border episodes – allowing for consideration of concrete efforts in practice. In addition to enhancing the depth and understanding possible in this thesis, the conceptual framework and research approach could potentially be applied, tested and further developed in the study of other border regions.
10.3 EXAMINING THE CASE STUDY CONTEXT

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 aimed to achieve Research Objective 3, which was to *critically examine the South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales subnational border region context within which opportunities and challenges exist for CBTM*. Combined, these chapters constitute one of the few analyses of an Australian border region; they are arguably the most complete analysis of a single border region in Australia, thus providing a clear contribution to knowledge by responding to the call for border research to be conducted in understudied regions (Newman & Paasi 1998; Yang & Peng 2012), including Australia (Pisani *et al.* 2009).

10.3.1 SUBNATIONAL BORDERS ARE MESSY AND IMPACTED BY MULTIPLE INFLUENCES

Chapter 5 aimed to critically examine the historical formation of the border and the boundaries that exist within the region. The chapter contributed the most in-depth historical analysis of an Australia border and began the process of bridging the knowledge gap with respect to bordering processes in an Australian subnational border region. In the course of the analysis, five key observations were made.

Firstly, the analysis confirmed that borders are messy and culturally constructed. Specifically, it was found that the state border central to the case study was formed through a highly contested, social process. Furthermore, since the formation of the border, the liminal space has been characterised as being socially complex, and involving multiple perspectives and interdependencies.

Secondly, the subnational borders are much messier than has been recognised in the literature and are in significantly more need of research attention. The findings support the arguments of Timothy (2001) and Newman and Paasi (1998), that subnational border regions can be just as messy as international border regions, particularly at state scale borders. These border processes, while felt most readily at the local and micro scales, were clearly conditioned by a range of actors both within and outside of the region, ‘with scale-crossing complexity’ (Paasi 2010: 2297).

Thirdly, functional boundaries can be different from social borders. While there are simplified perspectives on borders that assume functional (or political-administration) borders align with social boundaries, this research has shown that the situation is more nuanced than this. The mere fact that, for a state agency, boundaries are at a certain location does not mean that tourists and tourism managers readily identify with and observe these boundaries. This supports the argument that borders can be viewed from a ‘multiplicity of (sometimes contradictory) perspectives’ (Rumford 2012: 894).
Fourthly, political-administrative borders are constantly changing due to political decisions and public policies. The way in which a certain government or agency views its role and gives meaning to borders impacts the way in which borderlanders interact and affects their cross-border capability. This is particularly true at the state scale, but also at the federal scale, with certain policies and programs being focused on different regions and having different boundaries.

Finally, multiple spatial boundaries can coexist. Functional and social borders are in a constant state of flux (Paasi 2009, 2010). Social boundaries evolve with changes in identity, promotional approaches and tourism demand. Functional boundaries evolve with changes in the political environment and depending on the policy issues being addressed. As these functional boundaries evolve, they cross, overlap and – on some occasions – align.

### 10.3.2 Adjacent Regions Can Be Different, But Face Similar Issues

Chapter 6 analysed three adjacent local government areas, located in a border region. It was found that subnational border regions can be highly diverse spaces, involving scale-crossing complexity. Five key observations were made, as follows.

Firstly, regions located beside one another do not necessarily share strong similarities, having differing capacities and interest in developing tourism. The chapter contributed the finding that adjacent local governments can be significantly different. It was evident there were distinct urban, rural and peri-urban spaces across the three LGAs. This means that adjacent regions may offer very different tourism experiences and attract different tourism markets, as well as have significantly different capacities and interest in developing tourism. This can mean collaboration is restricted, as differences can lead to challenges that limit partnerships.

Secondly, adjacent regions, while being different, can share opportunities due to their proximity. Two or more regions may have very limited interaction or share very few characteristics, but they can, nevertheless, be faced with a similar environment. It has been highlighted adjacent regions can share unique assets with important tourism potential. Despite sharing opportunities, functional boundaries can significantly impact the way and extent on which they are capitalised.

Thirdly, proximity to a state border has implications for those who reside in the region and, at the same time, impacts the management of tourism. Extending on a key finding in Chapter 5 that subnational border regions can be messy, this chapter has shown that subnational borders do influence activity in adjacent regions. Issues can range from different time zones to poorly coordinated planning. Border issues can also directly and significantly affect the way tourism managers operate in a border region.
Fourthly, actors at higher scales can have an awareness of border issues in border regions. Numerous researchers have claimed that actors, and particularly governments, may have limited interest in and concern for issues that exist in international border regions (Buursink 2001; Herzog 1990, 1991, 2014; Herzog & Sohn 2014; Martinez 1994b). Chapter 6 questioned this argument in the case of subnational border regions, providing evidence of initiatives that show governments acknowledging issues in border regions.

Finally, while attempts by actors at higher scales may be made to overcome barriers, they are piecemeal and have limited impact. In subnational border regions, while higher scale governments have some level of responsibility for assisting regions within their jurisdictions, assistance may not be substantial enough to have any lasting impact on what is a highly wicked problem. While higher scales may attempt to assist subnational border regions to overcome border issues, at the same time it is the very same scales that are generally creating many of the issues.

10.3.3 CROSS-BORDER TOURISM MANAGEMENT IS PROJECT-BASED AND CONTEXTUAL

Chapter 7 introduced three CBTMEs in the case study border region. It contributed one of the first analyses of episodes of cross-border tourism management, as opposed to the more common investigation of the constraints to greater integration of government areas across borders.

Four key findings were made in the chapter.

Firstly, cross-border tourism projects can change significantly over both time and space. It was observed in the CBTMEs that, over time, different actors, at a range of scales, expanded and contracted their involvement in certain cross-border projects. At some points in time, actors in certain areas had limited interest in contributing to cross-border efforts; at other times such activity aligned with their organisation’s policy priorities and interests. The areas covered by cross-border tourism projects changed over time through a negotiated process, lending support to the arguments made by Paasi (1996, 2011). In other words, the “rebordering” of the border region through cross-border tourism projects was a dynamic, social process.

Secondly, the CBTMEs were driven by individuals and their ongoing persistence to navigate the complexities and messiness of cross-border activities. This finding supports the arguments of those such as Gelbman and Keinan (2007) who argue that cross-border work is not completed by regions, but rather by individuals within border communities. In the case study, while two episodes were completely local initiatives, the third, AGC, initiated as a result of a Federal Government initiative, but was driven by a local committee.
Thirdly, local governments, and the people working within them, can play a key role in subnational border tourism management. Across the three CBTMEs, local governments certainly did, often initiating and driving the projects. This finding supports research that has argued the importance of local governments in regional tourism destination management, especially within Australia (Dredge & Jenkins 2007; Lickorish & Jenkins 1997). This may not be the case in all countries, given the different government structures in each nation, but it supports the subsidiarity principle underlying Australia’s system of government. Despite Australian local governments having limited resources and powers (Dollery & Crase 2004; Dollery & Johnson 2005; Dredge et al. 2011a) to manage border issues, their constituents are impacted by the border on a daily basis, meaning they are required to take action.

Fourthly, while local governments and individuals within border regions often initiate and drive cross-border efforts, they can be highly dependent on funding and tourism data from higher scales. This finding contributes to our understanding of subnational border regions, showing subnational border regions hold a similarity with international border regions in locations like the EU, where it has been found cross-border projects need to be locally driven but funding decisions are made by higher scales, such as the European Commission (OECD 2013; Zimmerbauer 2011). Similar to the EU situation, the episodes focused on in this thesis relied heavily on higher scales of government for funding and tourism data, but higher scales were not involved in governance or objective-setting for the projects (OECD 2013).

10.4 CROSS-BORDER TOURISM MANAGEMENT KEY FINDINGS

Chapters 8 and 9 responded to Research Objective 4, which was to synthesise and evaluate the opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM in the subnational border region of South-East Queensland and Northern Rivers, New South Wales. This focus on opportunities and challenges makes a clear contribution to bridging the significant gap in the literature identified in Chapter 3, where it was claimed that very little research has been completed on cross-border tourism in subnational border regions, particularly at state scale borders; it also responds to calls for further research on cross-border tourism more broadly (Gupta & Dada 2011; Haugland et al. 2011; Naipaul et al. 2009; Sofield 2006; Timothy 2000a). In addition, it narrows the gap identified in the literature with respect to the very little research attention that Australia’s border regions have received (Pisani et al. 2009), despite knowledge of issues presented by borders within this context (Jackson & Murphy 2002; Lade 2006b, 2010; Smith 2005, 2011). Practitioners have confirmed the significance of the research, when the findings have been presented (Hills 2013a, 2013b).
10.4.1 OPPORTUNITIES FOR CROSS-BORDER TOURISM MANAGEMENT

Chapter 8 contributed a synthesis and evaluation of the opportunities in the case study border region. It found that opportunities exist to work collaboratively across subnational borders, both at state and local borders. This finding aligns with the arguments in the international tourism and border studies literature, which have promoted the importance of cross-border efforts in border regions. Seven key findings were uncovered with regard to opportunities.

Firstly, most of the themes recognised in the case study border region were centred on demand definitions of tourism destinations (see Table 8.1, on page 169). Rather than seeing tourism destinations as a priori regions constrained by existing political-administrative boundaries, the actors recognised opportunities to package tourism assets across borders and develop tourism offerings, particularly through promotional material, that were believed to better fit the experiences of tourists. This unveiled the insight that subnational actors can see opportunities from ‘marketing-management’ and ‘customer-oriented’ perspectives (Saraniemi & Kylänen 2011: 135-6).

Secondly, the broader set of opportunities recognised in the international border literature is not necessarily recognised by actors in subnational border regions. It was found that subnational borderlanders, when taking marketing, management or customer-oriented perspectives, might not see the broader range of opportunities that can come from cross-border collaboration. The cost of being overly focused on “joining-up” products and tourism experiences is that it limits the extent to which actors develop resilience, new knowledge and innovative management practices.

Thirdly, different opportunities are recognised by different actors when partaking in CBTM in subnational border regions. The multi-perspective nature of CBTM means that, while general agreement may exist as to the concept of CBTM in a subnational border region, different actors in different regions may see different opportunities in their participation. This finding shows that evidence of cross-border collaboration within a subnational border region cannot be seen as a sign that all of the actors view opportunities in the same way.

Fourthly, the way in which local actors give meaning to the state border is highly opportunistic and responsive to initiatives at higher scales. Although the higher scales, through their rigid view of the border, create many of the issues that local actors face in border regions, local actors were opportunistic and responsive to initiatives at higher scales. This reinforces the multi-scale nature of CBTM, but puts into question the relevance of the argument in the international literature that borderlanders try to avoid higher scales (Herzog 1991; House 1980; Martinez 1994b). This thesis has demonstrated that, while local actors can be at the heart of CBTM, the actions of these actors can be highly influenced by the policies and political decisions at a
particular time and space at higher scales. Given the vertical fiscal imbalance in Australia (OECD 2015), it is argued that cross-border tourism efforts that are not opportunistic and responsive to higher scale are unlikely to succeed.

Fifthly, opportunities in subnational CBTM can be pursued on a project-based basis. In the case study subnational border region, it was found that CBTM opportunities were pursued on an ad hoc, often organic, project basis. While much of the international research on CBTM has focused on the opportunities and challenges of cross-border tourism by considering how government actors in a priori regions work collaboratively (e.g. Naipaul et al. 2009; Skäremo 2016; Wang et al. 2013), it has been found that cross-border tourism collaboration is not necessarily pursued by entire local governments. Rather, cross-border tourism opportunities can be pursued by networks of individual actors within a range of different types of organisations in a subnational border region, on an informal basis.

Sixthly, the recognition of and decision to pursue CBTM opportunities emerge over time and space. Driven by individuals and personalities, different actors in the case study border region recognised opportunities from cross-border collaboration at different stages. While the episodes held few of the characteristics of true collaboration (Jamal & Getz 1995), this finding proves that tourism management across subnational borders changes over time and space, as some actors become more involved and others less. Research that only considers cross-border tourism collaboration at a single point in time would not effectively recognise the emergent nature of such efforts.

Finally, it was found that greater integration of border regions may not be seen as an opportunity in subnational border regions. While some researchers in the international border studies community, such as Martinez (1994b), see complete integration of border regions as the main aim of cross-border efforts, the appetite for something similar in subnational border regions may be limited. Subnational borderlanders may not be able to see beyond the borders that they deal with on a daily basis, or they may hold the perspective that such significant structural change to existing borders is unrealistic.

10.4.2 CHALLENGES FOR CROSS-BORDER TOURISM MANAGEMENT

Given the opportunities that exist for CBTM in subnational border regions, Chapter 9 asked what constrains the volume and quality of outcomes of such efforts. Eight key findings were made with regard to the underlying challenges to CBTM.

Firstly, many of the themes uncovered in the case study subnational border region were shared with previous studies of international border regions (see Table 9.1, on page 197). Exceptions to this were issues that would be expected to be more common in international situations, such as
difficulties for tourists to cross borders, and histories of conflict and war. A further theme not previously recognised in the literature was concern about local government regions being under-represented in determining the boundaries of new cross-border initiatives.

Secondly, challenges to CBTM exist at all types of borders. While the state border proved to be a significant challenge at the higher scales, and created numerous border issues, local government (third-order) borders and “mental borders” featured strongly in the case study region. This underscores that, while state borders may be important in understanding the challenges involved in subnational CBTM, other subnational boundaries cannot be overlooked in research on state border regions. Furthermore, the work on regional identities (e.g. Lebow 2013; Paasi 1996, 2009) cannot be ignored in studying CBTM in subnational border regions, as this thesis has found that mental borders exist both within and across functional borders.

Thirdly, different local governments can have significantly different levels of collaborative capacity. While international case studies have found that some organisations lack the resources required for effective collaboration (e.g. Pechlaner et al. 2002; Tosun et al. 2005), this thesis found that organisations in subnational border regions might have differing levels of assets and infrastructure (or “products”) to offer tourists as well as differing resources (funds, as well as social and intellectual capital) to participate in CBTM. This can be a significant challenge to CBTM in subnational border regions, as it can create power imbalances and cause actors to question whether cross-border collaboration is worthwhile.

Fourthly, CBTM in subnational border regions can face ingrained distrust from other actors. Evaluation of the case study subnational border region shows that actors in the cross-border episodes were concerned about “their” region being under-represented, about actors providing uneven input and about spending “their” funds across borders. This is a significant challenge, as trust of actors has been found to be an important factor in effective collaboration (Jamal & Getz 1995; Watkins & Bell 2002). This finding also aligns with numerous studies of collaboration in tourism that have found trust to be a barrier to effective collaboration among tourism actors (see Table 3.3, on page 36).

Fifthly, local actors and local governments in subnational border regions can have different priorities and perspectives regarding tourism. This thesis has shown that these different priorities and perspectives of tourism can be a challenge to CBTM in subnational border regions. In locations with a high level of diversity, such as the case study border region, this challenge would be expected to be particularly significant whereas, in regions where tourism is highly important across adjacent regions, this would be less of an issue.
Sixthly, cross-border collaboration in subnational border regions can be challenged by different meanings of the border among different actors. In the case study border region, while some actors at the local scale perceived the political-administrative borders as fluid, actors at both the local scale and higher scales (particularly State Government agencies) held different perceptions of the same borders, seeing them as rigid and standing in the way of cross-border government funding. While networks of actors at the local scale may attempt to initiate CBTM across subnational border regions, other local actors and State Government actors can be important gatekeepers in blocking support for cross-border efforts.

Seventhly, meanings of borders change over time and space, meaning that support can be short-lived. This thesis has highlighted that, while higher scales can at times see borders as fluid spaces, requiring and worthy of support, a significant challenge to CBTM in subnational border regions is that support, usually in the form of funding, can often be fleeting. This is linked to the constant shifts in decision-making and changes of policy at all scales of government, which impact all tourism destinations. The challenge is particularly significant in border regions, as local actors need to deal with the additional complexity of working in a liminal space intersected by multiple political structures and sets of scales (Timothy 2001; Timothy & Teye 2004).

Finally, the organic nature of cross-border projects may be creating challenges for the success of CBTM in subnational border regions. In the case study border region, there was little clarity regarding the ultimate objective of specific cross-border efforts: roles and responsibilities were unclear, milestones were not effectively set and projects not effectively evaluated. If member actors are not clear on expectations and have limited commitment to CBTM projects, given the often complex context of subnational border regions, the sustainability of such efforts is likely to be severely challenged, as are learning and project evaluation outcomes.

### 10.5 Developing a Theoretical Framework

In addressing the first four research objectives of this thesis, a range of key features of CBTM in the case study subnational border emerged. Reliance on the replication logic advocated in the case study literature (Eisenhardt 1989, 1991; Eisenhardt & Graebner 2007; Yin 2009) made it possible to build a theoretical framework to explain the complexities of CBTM in subnational border regions, and to allow for further analysis and testing, thus providing a clear contribution to knowledge by responding to the call for stronger conceptualisation of border regions (Newman 2006a) and bridging the significant gap in the literature regarding subnational border regions, established in Chapter 3.
It has been shown that CBTM in subnational border regions is messy, in that multiple actors at multiple scales shape it, each with differing perspectives towards tourism and borders. The most prominent model seen in the border studies literature is that provided by Martinez (1994b) (see Figure 2.1, on page 15), who categorises border regions as existing somewhere along a continuum from completely alienated to completely integrated. This model, which has also been used in considering the levels of cross-border partnerships in tourism (Timothy 1999), has limited usefulness in effectively explaining the realities of CBTM in subnational border regions. However, amendments to the model make it possible to begin to see the nuanced and complex aspects of the environment. Figure 10.1 shows that, contrary to the simplified model of Martinez (1994b), CBTM in subnational border regions is highly nuanced, characterised by multiple borders, multiple networks, multiple scales and multiple meanings of borders. Nonetheless, while this figure presents a diversion from an existing model, it still lacks the ability to visualise complex relationships involved in CBTM in subnational border regions.

![Figure 10.1 Border Perspectives at a Single Point in Time](image)

**Local Scale**
Local actors, some of whom are interested in cross-border projects and some who are not. Actors and networks overlap, change, appear and disappear within and across borders.

**State Government Scale**
Borders are generally seen as *a priori*, fixed and rigid. Projects are supported on an ad hoc basis.

**Federal Government Scale**
Holds a national agenda, but limited by borders due to limited constitutional powers and the perspectives of the states. Supports projects on an ad hoc basis.

Source: Developed for this research, based on Martinez (1994b: 3)

Figure 10.2 presents a theoretical framework of CBTM in subnational border regions, based on the findings of this research. The *international context* represents the global trends and shifts that are occurring and that impact all tourism destination regions; they include changing consumer tastes, advances in technology and the evolving global political environment. The *national context* represents the national climate within which tourism destination regions operate. It includes national policies on tourism and other relevant policy areas (e.g. environmental and transport policy), domestic consumer tastes, the national economic situation and shifts in demographics. The *state context* parallels many of the elements at the
national scale, with state policy decisions and priorities being particularly important to border regions, as they determine the way local governments are organised and the type of funding available to border regions to pursue cross-border projects. The state context may be significantly different in two adjacent states.

The *border region* represents the location where the tourism industry exists; it requires flows of capital, people, information and goods to supply tourism experiences in return for revenue. Within a border region, *local governments* exist, each with their own policies and priorities. Actors both within local governments and within other organisations make decisions about whether they become involved in *CBTM projects*. The *time and space axes* represent the fact that border regions and the multiple scales of context within which they operate constantly change. Finally, the arrows represent flows of *funds, data and information* and *proposals*.

Figure 10.2 Theoretical Framework of CBTM in Subnational Border Regions

Source: Developed for this research
10.6 RECOMMENDATIONS ON MANAGING CROSS-BORDER TOURISM

The final key aspect of this research was to respond to Research Objective 5, which was to *provide recommendations regarding how to manage the opportunities and challenges of subnational CBTM in Australia*. By providing recommendations that are relevant to the Australian situation, based on the understanding generated in this thesis, the research contributes to a poorly understood area of the literature. It also specifically deals with the challenges that, according to previous research (Jackson & Murphy 2002; Lade 2006b, 2010; Smith 2005, 2011), have been found to exist in subnational border regions.

This thesis has confirmed that CBTM is a wicked problem. It has been posited that wicked problems are difficult to define, have no clear solution and commonly involve chronic policy fatigue (Australian Public Service Commission 2007; Phi *et al.* 2010; Rittel & Webber 1973). While it is difficult to contribute to the way in which a wicked problem is dealt with, failure to act on CBTM in Australia’s, and other countries’, subnational border regions would mean that the challenges and issues that exist in such locations would remain unresolved. Furthermore, in the words of House (1980: 463), border regions ‘have special problems and merit specific policies, the more so in that problems are likely to grow worse with public inaction’. Analysis considered possible ways to improve CBTM and found that some options were not realistic within the context.

The first option considered was for the Federal Government to use a top-down approach. An approach of this kind could have been modelled on the EU border region model, where communities adjacent to a border are encouraged to establish regional committees and construct new boundaries to increase the cohesion of the adjacent regions, while also accessing significant sums of money to undertake such work. Based on the EU experience (Paasi 2002b; Trippl 2010) and the fiscal situation of many local governments in Australia (Dollery & Johnson 2005; Dredge *et al.* 2011a; OECD 2015; Ramsland & Dollery 2011), while local governments may work collaboratively to form committees to access funds, there would be a significant risk of border regions becoming ‘regions on paper’ as opposed to being ‘regions in social practice’ (Paasi 2002b: 198). This research has found that local actors drive CBTM in Australian subnational border regions, and that this is also the case elsewhere (OECD 2013; Timothy & Teye 2004; Verbole 2000, 2009).

A stronger challenge to the feasibility of this option is that it may result in unconstitutional funding decisions on the part of the Commonwealth Government. Aside from concerns held by non-border regions that they would not be receiving a similar level of support, the High Court *Williams v Commonwealth* [2012] HCA 23 decision puts into question the constitutional power held by the Commonwealth to directly fund specific locations. The same decision puts into
question the powers of the Commonwealth to directly fund specific organisations, such as local
governments, making the provision of funding to specially selected regions potentially
unconstitutional (Ratnapala 2014).

Another option would be to establish Border Management Organisations that transcend existing
subnational borders and assist with the sharing of knowledge and resources. Such organisations
could include actors from both the public and private sectors, and would be a response to calls
by O’Neill (2008: 7) for border communities to ‘develop approaches to support the particular
opportunities of regions near the State’s borders’. Such an approach could be driven by local
actors, but would necessitate support above and beyond existing funding from higher scales of
government, most probably from the Commonwealth Government, delivered through the
relevant State and Territory Governments (due to the constitutional limitations on the
Commonwealth Government). The structural nature of establishing such new forms of
governance in border regions would require changes to existing State and Territory legislation
to allow local councils to form legal structures with organisations in another State or Territory.
This thesis has shown that State Government agencies have tended to see state borders as
barriers, meaning that such an option would have limited political traction.

The most significant issue in establishing specific organisations crossing a subnational border is
that this would create newly defined regions and new boundaries that would not necessarily
align with opportunities, tourism products and tourism experiences. In other words, it would
remove the agility and responsiveness that is currently available to borderlanders and
increasingly important in a globalised world (Beritelli et al. 2013), as well as in highly
situational and contextual border regions (Newman & Paasi 1998). The existing locally led
approach acknowledges and leverages the highly situational and contextual nature of border
regions, where only local borderlanders have a full understanding of their region. Actors work
across borders with other actors in response to perceived tourist needs and where they see
opportunity.

The most appropriate approach to improving CBTM is through the three following key
recommendations, which recognise what is realistic within the Australian federal system of
government. Table 10.2 provides an overview of the links between the recommendations and
the key findings of the research. Each of the recommendations is then discussed in turn.
Table 10.2 Recommendations and Links to Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use best practice principles to improve cross-border tourism project</td>
<td>▪ Different actors recognise different opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management.</td>
<td>▪ Local governments have differing levels of collaborative capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Recognition of and the decision to pursue CBTM projects emerge over time and space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Local actors are opportunistic to initiatives at higher scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Multiple priorities and perspectives on tourism exist within the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism to encourage ongoing</td>
<td>▪ Adjacent regions can be different, but share opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse among border region councils.</td>
<td>▪ Local governments have differing levels of collaborative capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Cross-border projects are focused on ‘marketing-management’ and ‘customer-oriented’ perspectives, rather than learning and knowledge sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Subnational border regions can face ingrained distrust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The organic nature of cross-border projects challenges CBTM success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve government support of cross-border regions through improved</td>
<td>▪ Higher scales are aware of border issues, but efforts to overcome them are piecemeal and have limited impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding mechanisms and the provision of more informative tourism data.</td>
<td>▪ Local governments play a leading role in CBTM, but are highly reliant on funding and tourism data provided by higher scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The multiple meanings of borders change over time and space, which means that support can be short-lived.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research

10.6.1 RECOMMENDATION 1: IMPROVE CROSS-BORDER PROJECT MANAGEMENT

This research has clearly shown that local actors in the episodes studied, particularly within local governments, initiated and drove cross-border tourism through cross-border projects. This allows for border regions to be managed in such a way as to maximise tourist experiences, by responding to constantly changing consumer needs (Beritelli et al. 2013; Blasco et al. 2014; King 2002). It also allows for local actors to be responsive to government initiatives at higher scales, where much of the funding is held in border regions internationally (OECD 2013), and specifically in Australia (OECD 2015). Despite the opportunities that a project-based approach may offer, poorly managed and scoped cross-border projects are unlikely to be sustainable, have effective outcomes, result in learning or lead to the strengthening of relationships between actors. Informed by the existing literature (Gibson & Lynch 2007; Gibson et al. 2005; Jamal & Getz 1995; Lee & Chok 2005; Pfueller et al. 2011; Wang et al. 2013; Wang & Xiang 2007; Watkins & Bell 2002) and the findings of this research, it is recommended that future cross-border projects are guided by the following principles:

- **Objectives.** Projects should be directed by specific aims and objectives agreed by the actors involved.
- **Fit.** There should be a clear fit between the selected target markets of a project and the experiences being offered.
- **Roles and responsibilities.** Actors need to set out and agree to the roles and responsibilities of each actor involved in a project.
• **Timing and outcomes.** The actors must ensure that clear outcomes and their timing are established. Outcomes should be set to occur throughout a project to maintain momentum.

• **Integration.** To maximise the potential for support, projects should be integrated with current and predicted plans and policies of higher scales of government.

• **Ongoing Management.** To ensure that projects retain momentum, an actor or a lead-organisation needs to have responsibility for ensuring that the outcomes are achieved and that actors are held accountable.

• **Resourcing.** It is important that actors set out what they are willing, and able, to contribute to a project from the beginning, to set realistic expectations of other actors.

• **Evaluation.** Cross-border projects naturally have an end-point, whether they achieve all of their defined outcomes or not. At this point, projects need to be evaluated and learnt from.

Well managed projects would mitigate several of the challenges found in the case study, including differences in collaborative capacity, ingrained distrust among actors and issues that emerge from different regions holding different perspectives and priorities regarding tourism. Actors would enter projects with a clear understanding of the aim of the project, and hold responsibility for what the expected outcome is.

### 10.6.2 Recommendation 2: Establish Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism

This research has found that local councils, and specifically the individuals within them, often initiate and drive CBTM in subnational border regions. The ad hoc and project-based nature of the cross-border initiatives, while important for agility and responsiveness, is a significant challenge in terms of maximising the benefits of CBTM and limits the influence that border region communities can have on higher scales. This thesis has shown that, while structural changes, such as the establishment of EU-style border regions and formal regional scale structures are not a realistic approach to CBTM, local councils frequently enter arrangements to work across borders, meaning this is a possibility within the legislation of the respective states.

A realistic recommendation is therefore for local councils to establish Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism in Australia’s subnational border regions, to encourage an ongoing discourse among border region councils. The concept of Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism is modelled on the work of Dollery and colleagues (e.g. Dollery & Johnson 2007; Ramsland & Dollery 2011), who have suggested existing local councils develop connections, to share resources and gain efficiencies in service delivery. It also aligns with initiatives to develop regional organisations of councils (e.g. Central Queensland Organisation of Councils 2016; Far North Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils 2016; NSW Government 2016a), albeit not across state
borders. It is contended here that efficiencies and resource pooling in CBTM should continue to be achieved through projects and networks, while other opportunities can be achieved through Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism. The boards would involve primarily council officers with responsibility for tourism, but may also incorporate council General Managers and elected officials, depending on interest and the collaborative capacity of each council.

Through meeting regularly, either monthly or bi-monthly, the actors would have an opportunity to share the priorities and strategies each council has for tourism, as well as discuss the issues they face in implementation and the opportunities they see in the market place for future tourism strategies. Through such a process, the actors would be able to better leverage the collaborative opportunities recognised in the literature, such as learning, information sharing, innovation, developing greater resilience and improving their ability to deal with complexity (Dredge et al. 2011a; Wang et al. 2013). The ongoing discourse among the actors would also increase the level of understanding each actor has of the situation of other actors, including issues such as collaborative capacity. In addition, actors would develop stronger relationships and improve levels of trust when undertaking CBTM projects together.

Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism in each of Australia’s subnational border regions where interest in cross-border tourism exists could potentially come together in a network of boards from each subnational border region. The network would discuss issues of common concern and the boards within it would thus be in a position to learn from one another. This harks back to the move to increase communication between separation movements through the All Australian New State Movement Convention in 1922 (Taylor 2006). The suggestion is supported by knowledge that numerous subnational border regions in Australia, in addition to the case study region in this thesis, have been found to face CBTM challenges (Lade 2006b, 2010; Strudwick 2011; Worrall 2010).

Regardless of whether a network of boards comes to fruition or not, individual subnational Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism would be able to increase the voice of borderlanders when negotiating with higher scales of government, whether to remove border-related issues or to gain support for cross-border projects. Through councils working together on an ongoing basis, irrespective of when cross-border projects begin and end, there would be an enduring voice for borderlanders to sell their successes and learn from their failures. This aligns with the recommendation of the OECD (2013: 27) for borderlanders in international border regions to ‘convince’ politicians at local and higher scales through ‘concrete and successful projects [that] can inspire’.
10.6.3 RECOMMENDATION 3: STRONGER SUPPORT FROM GOVERNMENTS

This research illustrates that higher scales of government influence the success of cross-border tourism projects. It has found that support constantly changes, with political decisions and changes of policy within each jurisdiction. This thesis, as well as research completed in other regions (Buursink 2001; Martinez 1994a; Verbole 2009), has shown that higher scales may have limited interest in assisting CBTM projects, particularly at the state scale. Although the Commonwealth is limited in terms of providing funding to specific regions and projects, it aims to ‘contribute to the prosperity of the economy and the wellbeing of all Australians by assisting regions to realise their potential and manage their own futures’ (Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development 2016a). For some time, particularly during the time of this research, Federal Government support has come in the form of national, competitive grant programs (Collits 2008; Kelly et al. 2009).

Given the difficulties that Australian subnational border regions have in attracting state funding, due to differing meanings of borders, it is recommended that the Commonwealth Government improve financial support for these regions. There is a precedent, since the Commonwealth already provides higher levels of matched funding and weighting to support projects in regions that are deemed to be disadvantaged in some way, particularly if classified as rural or remote regions (Australian Government 2016). This has not previously included border regions, despite the disadvantages they can face in securing funding due to their position between jurisdictions. It is recommended that the Commonwealth Government adjust its grants programs to better support border regions’ tourism efforts through introducing a disadvantage weighting for border regions, reducing the required level of matched funding required from cross-border projects and increasing the period of grants from the usual two to three years to a longer five to six years, to allow for complex cross-border work to be carried out. State Governments could implement similar border region supporting elements within their tourism and regional programs, although this support would be unlikely without a clear history of cross-border success promoted by Cross-border Joint Boards of Tourism.

A further finding of this thesis is that local governments and other tourism actors in subnational border regions lack data and information susceptible to assist them to effectively understand tourism-related flows into and within the border region. It is recommended that the Commonwealth Government, as well as the State and Territory Governments, provide more meaningful tourism and other spatial data to local councils and other actors in border regions. Specifically, governments should follow the lead of the Øresund border region, in Denmark and Sweden, to more accurately measure flows across and within borders (OECD 2013; Øresunds Committee 2014).
The Commonwealth Government should move to a national statistical system that better recognises the connections between adjacent regions, particularly across State and Territory Government boundaries. This would require agencies such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics moving away from the current Statistical Areas, which are referred to as ‘functional zones’, but are limited by political-administrative borders (ABS 2016b). This recommendation aligns well with the move by the Commonwealth to embrace big data, which is not necessarily limited by political-administrative borders (ABS 2014), and open data, to allow other governments and the public to access information relevant to them (Australian Government 2015a).

10.7 Significance of the Research

This thesis has made a significant contribution to theory, through the investigation of a poorly understood area in the border studies and tourism studies literature. It was established in Chapter 3 that borders and border regions were poorly understood (Alm & Burkhart 2013; Newman 2006a; Newman & Paasi 1998), and that borders had received limited attention in the tourism research community (Gupta & Dada 2011; Haugland et al. 2011; Naipaul et al. 2009; Sofield 2006; Timothy 2000a). This research contributes to bridging this substantial gap in knowledge by appraising existing work primarily focused on international border regions in Europe and North America, and developing a conceptual framework and research approach to investigate the relevance of this existing knowledge for the management of tourism in the unique case of Australia’s subnational border regions.

The critical examination of an Australian subnational border region is nationally significant, as it is the first known in-depth study of a state border in the country. Australia is the only continent that has never been the focus of an article in the Journal of Borderland Studies (Pisani et al. 2009). Furthermore, the critical examination of an Australian subnational border region is also internationally significant, as it is among the first investigations of a state scale border in any country internationally, despite state scale borders being theorised as impacting border region communities, as much as international borders (Buursink 2001; Newman & Paasi 1998; Timothy 2001). This research has confirmed that state borders do have a significant impact on tourism management in Australia’s subnational border regions, while also confirming the characteristics of tourism border processes, including their contextual, messy and scale-crossing nature. The research has made a significant contribution to understanding why tourism actors in Australia’s subnational border regions make the decision to work across political-administrative borders. It has also contributed an in-depth analysis of the challenges in an Australian subnational border region, following numerous studies that have reported “border anomalies” impacting tourism management (Jackson & Murphy 2002; Lade 2006b, 2010; Smith 2005, 2011).
Moreover, the research has extended our understanding of cross-border tourism by developing a theoretical framework of cross-border tourism in subnational border regions. The framework presents a perspective that assists in understanding the messy, contextual, networked, multi-scale and multiple perspective nature of CBTM in subnational border regions. This contribution to knowledge is significant in that it provides a basis for further research and theory building in other subnational border regions in Australia and internationally. It would be expected that this framework would be particularly relevant to other countries with a federal structure.

This thesis has made a significant contribution to practice through providing insight into how tourism management functions across political-administrative borders. While the research is likely to be most relevant to subnational border regions, the insights that have been gained are relevant for a large proportion of the 10,000 destination management organisations globally (Pike 2008), many of which share borders with other DMOs within their own country. The thesis has also contributed recommendations to improve CBTM that have regional significance to the Australian Central East Coast border region, national significance to other Australian subnational border regions and global significance to subnational border regions in other countries.

This thesis has a reach and significance that potentially goes beyond tourism management, in that it offers practical insights and a basis for further research in fields outside of tourism, which would also benefit from improvement in cross-border management. Such fields could include a range of policy areas, from environmental management and local planning to health and crime prevention. Rather like tourism issues, issues in many other policy areas are rarely bound by the political-administrative borders under which they are managed.

10.8 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH AND FURTHER RESEARCH

This research has focused on the opportunities and challenges for CBTM in three CBTMEs in a case study of a subnational border region adjacent to the NSW-QLD State border on the central east coast of Australia. This necessarily involved a limited number of actors, projects and places in a specific period of time. While it has been useful in the generation of theory and in developing recommendations on how to improve the management of CBTM, the exploratory nature of the research means that further research is needed to extend knowledge and strengthen the theory generated. Further research that would overcome the limitations of this study include further qualitative case study research that acknowledges the uniqueness of each border region, and, where possible, quantitative studies to test the generalisability of findings to other regions and sectors.
The opportunities and challenges that exist for CBTM in subnational border regions having now been established, provides a clear avenue for research that would include testing the theory developed in other subnational border regions, both in Australia (particularly in areas where tourism is prevalent, such as along the Murray River, in the Mallee region, and on the south-east coast – where the States of NSW and Victoria meet) and overseas. Internationally, it would be particularly interesting to compare the findings of this research with CBTM at other state, province or canton borders in federations with multiple government scales. Research at these borders, as well as borders at other scales, needs to consider businesses adjacent to a border. Businesses could potentially benefit from being near a border, although they may also face significant challenges. Taking the advice of Macbeth, Burns, Chandler, Revitt and Veitch (2002), a broader range of actors also need to be the focus of future research on tourism in borders, with Indigenous people and Indigenous borders being particularly understudied.

Despite tourism destinations being central to tourism management, one of the profound findings of this research was that very few studies have considered how tourists view destinations and how tourists travel throughout a region. In the case study border region, no data existed to assist tourism management actors in understanding how tourists travel throughout their region and, thus, across borders. Further research should follow the lead of Pearce and Schänzel (2013, 2015), by investigating the tourist’s perspective in travelling throughout a border region. This research could take the form of exploratory focus groups and interviews, or quantitative analysis of tourists moving across borders. It would be particularly useful to investigate the experiences of tourists crossing borders within the EU, in the context of changes driven by the Syrian refugee influx (Bouras 2016; Chen 2015; Hartley-Brewer 2015; Morris & Gray 2015) and Brexit (The Economist 2016). Ultimately, while local actors and actors at higher scales play an important role in the management of tourism, tourists are the reason why tourism destinations exist.

Contrary to some views, this research is among the first to confirm that subnational border regions are a rich area of research. As such, it would be worthwhile to investigate other cross-border management activities, beyond tourism, to understand to what extent they can be explained by the theory generated in this thesis.
This research process started as a process of exploration and always had the aim of not only making a significant contribution to knowledge, but also of providing direct and relevant practical insights to assist those living in border regions with tourism management. The author is grateful for the participants allowing him to enter their episodes, even for a short while, and for sharing their experiences. It is hoped that the research has not only been enlightening for the author, but will also inform the actions of those directly impacted by subnational borders.

From the time this research began to the time it was submitted for examination, the world has changed. Globally, the borderless world argument has lost significant strength, with considerable numbers of refugees travelling through Europe and governments strengthening borders, calls in the USA for stronger border control on the Mexican-USA border and, last but not least, the Brexit decision. In Australia, the Federal Government changed in 2013, with the Liberal Party continuing to hold government in the 2016 election. The Commonwealth Government’s tourism policy has continued to be directed by the Tourism 2020 Strategy first published in 2010, with an implementation plan produced in 2015. Tourism Australia continues to focus on inbound tourism, while the Australian Trade Commission continues to focus on foreign investment.

At the state scale, in 2011, the NSW Government changed with the Liberal Party taking office. Since 2012, tourism policy in the State has continued to be directed by the Visitor Economy Industry Action Plan, implemented by the Department of Trade and Investment, while the NSW Government has also been driving a restructuring of local governments under the “Fit for the Future” initiative (NSW Government 2016a). On the other hand, in 2015, the Labor Party won the QLD election. The Government established the Department of Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games, and maintained Tourism and Events Queensland as a statutory body. As was the case for the previous Government, the 2018 Commonwealth Games to be held on the Gold Coast continue to be a significant focus for Queensland, although cross-border opportunities are not being pursued as part of the plans, despite proximity to the Northern Rivers. At the time of submission, the Queensland Government had announced the development of a Queensland Tourism and Transport Strategy, but progress was unclear.

The changes discussed here support the argument that borders are not static. While this thesis has not captured the recent changes in the environment, the depth and breadth of the exploration of the case study border region is unprecedented and necessarily represents a snapshot in time. Cross-border collaboration involves socio-political and institutional challenges, and the understandings generated in this research have ongoing evolutionary relevance for the future.
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### 12 APPENDICES

#### Appendix A: Review of Studies into Barriers to Tourism Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Study Region</th>
<th>Barriers to Tourism Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buhalis and Cooper (1998)</td>
<td>Case study based on literature and prior research</td>
<td>Greek Aegean Islands</td>
<td>Small-to-medium firms are said to be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Myopic with regards to only seeing competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not interested in collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Unwilling to cooperate as they are concerned they will lose their independence and flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler and Weidenfeld (2011)</td>
<td>Secondary data and in-depth interviews with tourism operators</td>
<td>Cornwall, UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited resources available within businesses to pursue both interests within the business and external, collaborative, activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collaboration not seen as a high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of trust among actors in a region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della Corte and Aria (2014)</td>
<td>Survey of 55 hotel managers and 25 travel agent managers</td>
<td>Naples and Sorrento, Italy</td>
<td>Lack of trust among actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge (2006a)</td>
<td>Case study analysis involving: interviews with Council Officers and local tourism representatives, attending meetings and organised workshops as a participant observer, and informal networking with tourism operators and community representatives</td>
<td>Interviews with council officers and local tourism reps in the Redland Shire, NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Unclear division of roles among lateral actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Disagreements over funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Certain lateral actors controlling the funding of other lateral actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Division along spatial boundaries within region (especially mainland versus islands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Differing products within regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Diverse levels of capacity of firms in region (leading to a predominance of family businesses in collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge et al. (2011a)</td>
<td>Case study analysis of two regional tourism destinations</td>
<td>Northern Rivers, NSW and Perth’s Eastern Metropolitan Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tourism is misunderstood by councillors and non-tourism council staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Top-down approaches are ineffective in developing collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erkus-Öztürk (2009)</td>
<td>In-depth interviews and questionnaires of tourism operators</td>
<td>12 tourism clusters in Antalya, Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small firms do not see themselves as part of the tourism industry and do not develop links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small firms are uneducated as to the positive benefits of clustering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyall and Garrod (2004)</td>
<td>Book written from literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mistrust and suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Excuses of a political, economic or administrative nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Some stakeholders fail to recognise the benefits of a collaborative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Concerns of leakage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduction in direct control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Collaboration is too time-consuming and costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson and Lynch (2007)</td>
<td>Literature review and description of three illustrative cases</td>
<td>Three cases</td>
<td>Contradictory value set among different actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Region/Destination</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Grängsjö (2003)                 | Observation, interviews, conversations and questionnaires of tourism operators | Operators in Åre, Sweden    | - Tourism operators are unable to consider competition and cooperation at the same time  
- Operators wish to maintain independence  
- Differing interests between firms |
| Jackson (2006)                  | Literature review, participant observation at a tourism forum, and interviews and questionnaires of ten high level tourism managers (from industry and government) in the region | Sichuan province of China   | - Highly competitive perspective (considered surprising considering collective culture of Chinese society)  
- Reliance on government to provide links between businesses (especially vertically)  
- Limited number of individual firms outside of state plans |
| Jamal and Getz (1995)           | Conceptual paper/literature review                                           |                             | - Operators may be deterred from collaboration due to:  
- Risk of free-loading  
- Fear of losing control, especially if unfamiliar with collaboration  
Municipalities may be deterred as:  
- They often compete with one another for scarce resources  
- They may lose control over decision making |
| Lade (2006b, 2007, 2010)        | Self-completed postal questionnaires sent to tourism business in four LGA regions (75-100 surveys per region) | Mildura, Swan Hill, Echuca and Albury/Wodonga – all located adjacent (or across) the Murray River (border between Victoria and NSW, Australia) | - Reluctance to share knowledge  
- Backward and close-minded thinking  
- Lack of organisation and leadership  
- Lack of time, interest and expertise  
- Business diversity  
- Existing conservative business clusters  
- Border anomalies |
| Lawrence (2009)                 | Semi-structured interviews, participant observation during meetings and archival analysis | Byron Bay Shire, NSW        | - Top-down approach, with one-way communication  
- Competition among government actors for funding  
- Indifference of distant actors as to tourism management in the local destination  
- Government agency fragmentation |
| Leiper et al. (2008)            | Conceptual paper, regarding the previous work of the authors and other literature |                             | - Not in the best interest of some firms serving tourists to have tourism strategies and, as such, collaboration with other tourism businesses may not be a good use of resources. |
| Macchiavelli (2001)             | Interviews with tourism operators                                            | Viareggio, Italy            | - Tourism operators are too myopic – only willing to consider the short-term  
- Tourism operators are not strategic thinkers |
<p>| Pechlaner and Tschurtschen-thaler (2003) | Survey of tourism businesses in European alpine regions | European alpine regions    | - Collaboration is too costly and time-consuming |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Saxena (2005)                 | Interviews with 45 business owners, volunteer organisations, and local authorities | Three learning regions between Sheffield and Manchester: Castleton, Bakewell & Tideswell | - Local acceptance of tourism development policies low  
- Businesses and volunteer organisations did not feel they were adequately included in local tourism efforts  
- Lack of research independent on the interests of funders  
- Operators were suspicious of the policies developed by policy makers, which lacked life experience with an over-emphasis on theories  
- Limited trust among actors |
| Selin (1993)                  | Literature review                    | North American focus                                 | - Geographical and organizational fragmentation  
- Long chain of distribution systems  
- Jurisdictional boundaries  
- Ideological differences  
- Centralised government decision making  
- Competitive rhetoric (in public agencies)  
- Pay for representation systems (including for chambers of commerce and tourism associations)  
- Emphasis on one-way communication |
- Different perspectives among local and distant actors  
- Existing social structures and history of the community |
| Wang and Fesenmaier (2007)   | Personal interviews with DMO representatives and tourism managers | Elkhart County, Northern Indiana                     | - Lack of motivation among actors  
- Different interests and values of actors  
- Lack of complementarities |
| Wang and Krakover (2008)     | Qualitative interviews with representative within the Convention and Visitor Bureau [CVB] and business managers | Elkhart County, Northern Indiana                     | - Tourism operators unable to perceive competition and cooperation at the same time (suggested that CVBs need to educate tourism providers)  
- Tourism marketing occurs at several scales |
| Wang (2008a)                 | Personal interviews with local tourism operators and staff in a local CVB | Elkhart Country, Northern Indiana                     | From the CVB’s perspective:  
- Industry questions the strategies of the CVB and, hence, do not buy in  
- Industry is annoyed when the CVB promotes attractions outside of the LGA  
- Expensive to involve industry in strategy  
From operators’ perspective:  
- Limited time  
- Limited staff availability  
- Not informed enough  
- Program of CVB is too rigid  
- 'Been there done that’ mentality  
- Waste of time to provide a public good |

Source: Developed for this research. Sources cited within.
## Appendix B Review of Studies into Barriers to Cross-border Tourism Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Study Region</th>
<th>Barriers to Cross-border Tourism Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrington (2010)</td>
<td>Historical analysis</td>
<td>Victoria Falls border region in Zambia and Zimbabwe</td>
<td>• Government policies and agendas different on each side of the border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Different industry focus on each side of the border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Government stifled tourism on one side of the border because of unilateral funding; lack of support results in differing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Competitiveness spurred by tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bieger et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Historical analysis and observation over time – including a period when tourism management regions were combined</td>
<td>Grinsons region in Switzerland, with a focus on DMOs and other industry leaders</td>
<td>Resistance to combining regions included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Differing funding structures in each existing region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disagreement over funding available for combined region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of losing power (resulting in the smaller regions continuing to complete some tasks, such as product development and lobbying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buursink (2001)</td>
<td>Literature review and conceptual analysis</td>
<td>Four regions – US/Mexico, Niagara Falls cities, Baltic borders and German/Czech borders</td>
<td>Niagara Falls cities (border drawn 1812), although sharing many characteristics, faced the following issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tradition of competition and rivalry fed by tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Differing levels of development (especially considering most tourists stay on the Canadian side of the border)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nations/States see the border as having different purposes (US – backdoor, Canada – front door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Different currencies make it irrational for tourists to spend on USA side of the border (although this has recently changed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Border-crossing traffic is rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Differing political and administrative systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron (2014)</td>
<td>In-depth interviews with Tourism Marketing Officers</td>
<td>The twin-island nations of Republic of Trinidad and Tobago; Saint Kits and Nevis; Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>• Differing products and markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional differences on each island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited by government bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some islands have a limited tourism product available, making marketing the ‘periphery’ a bad investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaboration can spoil destination image by association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Differing agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsenstein and Freeman (2001)</td>
<td>Accounting approach to illustrate the “prisoner’s dilemma” in a border region</td>
<td>Taba, Egypt and Eilat, Israel</td>
<td>• Differences in national laws directly impact border regions and require cross-border collaboration to overcome negative impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Casino-based tourism in the border region resulted in competition and differentials in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goetz and Kayser (1993)</td>
<td>Postal questionnaire</td>
<td>Economic development agencies (EDAs) in a twin-city region in Minnesota</td>
<td>• EDAs felt that individual economic development issues (e.g. tourism) were low priority for cross-border collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EDAs were too focused on competition to cooperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Location/Case Study</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon (2007)</td>
<td>Interviews with county Economic Development Agency Managers Selected counties across Illinois</td>
<td>“The greatest obstacles toward cooperation may continue to be ingrained attitudes of local government officials” (73) Local officials consider other neighbouring regions foremost as competition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon (2009)</td>
<td>22 in-depth interviews with economic development agencies, other government officials and business leaders in counties across five USA States Selected neighbouring counties in the States of Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky and Tennessee</td>
<td>Elected officials do not understand the benefits of cooperation, as they feel accountable to constituents Economic development agency actors perceived their greatest competition to be neighbouring counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta and Dada (2011)</td>
<td>Desk research case study Indian/Pakistani border region</td>
<td>Lack of border crossing locations Strenuous border crossing procedures Some groups are not allowed to cross the border</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson (2001)</td>
<td>Historical/document analysis of tourism collaboration in a region The Greater Mekong Subregion</td>
<td>Differing political systems and administrative structures Histories of conflict among countries Different levels of tourism development Borders are difficult for tourists to cross Differing images of destinations as tourist offerings Poor communication Absence of private sector support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioannides et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Interviews with government and business actors Seven Swedish municipalities and five Finnish subregions in the Bothnian Arc region</td>
<td>Businesses do not see any reason to collaborate Businesses do not feel involved in the government-led, top-down program Cross-border region ‘has an image problem’ (135) ‘hindered by excessive bureaucracy and stifling regulatory mechanism’ (135) Differences in regulations (taxation and currency) Invisible physical border, but mental division particularly around language Crossing the rather large region via air requires stopping in the far-removed capital cities of each nation The region has a limited differentiated tourism product, leading to competition among businesses and local authorities The region is simply too large (as much as 400km across) for collaboration to occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lade (2006b, 2007, 2010)</td>
<td>Self-completed postal questionnaires sent to tourism business in four LGA regions (75-100 surveys per region) Mildura, Swan Hill, Echuca and Albury/ Wodonga – all located adjacent (or across) the Murray River (border between Victoria and NSW, Australia)</td>
<td>Among the factors considered to be impacting tourism clusters are said to be ‘border anomalies’ for destinations in border regions (e.g. Albury/Wodonga)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Factors inhibiting collaboration from CVBs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagiewski and Revelas (2004)</td>
<td>Survey of 44 respondents including businesses, government, non-government organisations and tourist boards</td>
<td>Border region of Dubrovnik-Neretva county, Croatia and Bay of Kotor and Budva, Montenegro</td>
<td>Poor treatment of citizens at border crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovelock and Boyd (2006)</td>
<td>Case study research, involving the researchers working as consultants to the region</td>
<td>Catlins region in New Zealand – South District Council, Otago and Clutha District Council, Sutherland</td>
<td>A move to a neo-liberal approach in New Zealand ‘has in a sense “stolen the wheels” off the vehicle of collaboration’ (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naipaul et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Qualitative case study approach – key informant interviews (industry and CVBs), focus groups and document analysis</td>
<td>Tri-county agri-tourism destination in Northern Ohio</td>
<td>Factors inhibiting collaboration from CVBs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Differing priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Different market directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of daring actions and focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen (2014); Nguyen and Pearce (2015)</td>
<td>In-depth interviews with DMO managers</td>
<td>Eight localities on the Vietnamese South Central Coast</td>
<td>Factors inhibiting collaboration from stakeholders:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived risk of working with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicting hours of operation, making it difficult to attend meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarce resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilsson et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Narrative approach to understanding tourism in three cross-border Interreg tourism programs in Europe. Secondary data used.</td>
<td>Pomerania (northern Germany and Poland); Nordkalotten (northern Finland, Norway and Sweden); and Skärgården (islands between Finland and Sweden)</td>
<td>Factors inhibiting collaboration from stakeholders:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Different barriers and issues depending on the region – history/‘baggage’ important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant distance between actors in the cross-border region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attempts are made to ‘downplay’ political issues like identity and border barrier effects, but these are not avoidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD (2013)</td>
<td>Desktop research and interviews</td>
<td>Six European border regions</td>
<td>Disagreement over regional branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Case Study/Region</td>
<td>Challenges/Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Paúl and Trillo-Santamaría (2014) | Interview and document analysis of historical border region                  | Couto Mixto region mainly located in Galicia, ES; but originally across Portugal and Spain | - Limited buy-in from local governments and tourist information centres  
- Cross-border signage and website has not been effectively maintained or managed  
- Lacking support from various scales of government (some financial support was offered by the EU for signage) |
| Quack (2007)             | Secondary research, as well as email, facsimile and mail questions sent to French and German tourism organisations | Local and (where appropriate) state tourism organisations across France and Germany | - Different administrative systems and funding measures make cross-border work very difficult  
- Bureaucratic administrative system in Germany was acknowledged to be providing minimal potential for cross-border work within Germany |
| Saxena and Ilbery (2010) | Secondary data analysis and semi-structured interviews with:  
  - Tourists (100)  
  - Gatekeepers (10)  
  - Businesses (51)  
  - Public agencies (20)  
  - Non-profit resource controllers (20)  
  - Residents (50) | Three tourism regions in the ‘less favoured area’ border region between England and Wales (Shropshire and Herefordshire in England and Powys in Wales) | - Perception that distant ‘pen-pushers’ do not understand the plight of locals, and particularly borderlanders  
- Differing actor roles and interests  
- ‘Relationship baggage’ – perception of British actors as exploiting the Welsh  
- Psychological/mental divide across the border |
| SAYA (2012)              | Secondary research on a case study region                                    | Focuses on Jerusalem, which includes areas considered Israeli and Palestinian according to the 1949 Armistice Agreements | - Political instability remains an issue for the region  
- No political coordination between governments  
- Separation ‘creates a vicious cycle of one-sided narratives and stereotypes’ (online) |
| Skåremo (2016)           | Seven semi-structured interviews with tourism destination managers           | Opportunities and challenges to cross-border tourism in the Øresund Region       | - Border controls impacting tourist movements  
- Uneven political power structures  
- Differing mindsets between Swedes and Danes |
| Studzieniecki and Mazurek (2007) | Described simply as ‘desk research’.                                       | BUG Region – border regions of Belarus, the Ukraine and Poland                  | - 31 barriers to tourists crossing the national borders (including visa, insurance, customs control, border control)  
- Differing tourism strategies  
- Differing political agendas and administrative systems  
- Component tourism destinations are not compatible |

50 A less favoured area (LFA) refers to a European Commission classified region that is ‘lagging’ in comparison to other regions in the EU.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research Methodology</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Issues and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teye (1988)</td>
<td>Literature review and synthesis</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Political instability due to military intervention, Border closures, Militarisation of seaports and airports, Dawn-to-dusk curfews, Maltreatment of foreign visitors, Language blocks, Differing political systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy (1995)</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Cultural differences across the border</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy (1999)</td>
<td>27 in-depth interviews with park administrators, park personnel, and Canadian and American border officials</td>
<td>Three cross-border international parks on the US-Canadian border</td>
<td>Lack of international treaties, Lack of official border concessions, Lack of treaty waivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy (2000a)</td>
<td>Literature review &amp; previous research by the author</td>
<td>Issues faced by managers of protected areas regarding cross-border parks: Cultural and political differences (create communication barriers and incompatible administrative practices), Unwillingness to collaborate due to the need to compromise sovereignty or absolute territorial control, Border demarcation and fortification (disrupting the functioning of ecosystems), Differing levels of development on each side of the border (and often differing environmental standards), Political and sociocultural position of border regions means that such regions are not included in economic development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy and Teye (2004)</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Global, regarding specific cases</td>
<td>Regulation of cross-border trade, Can result in elites on each side of the border holding control of decisions, Difficulties for tourists crossing borders, Socio-economic differences on each side of the border, Government actors on each side of the border have contrasting mandates and management priorities/strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosun et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Focus groups, in-depth interviews, personal knowledge and experience, a wide-ranging literature review (published and unpublished information)</td>
<td>Turkey and Greece (interest in whole countries, but discusses them as borderlands)</td>
<td>Political sensitivity and unwillingness of politicians, Lack of financial resources to support cooperation, Lack of experience in cooperating, especially with one another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wachowiak (2006)</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>‘Different administrative structures of local, regional, and national authorities result in different decision making processes. This is especially important if it comes to cross-border co-operation, especially on a local and regional level’ (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang (2008a)</td>
<td>Personal interviews with operators</td>
<td>Elkhart Country, Northern Indiana</td>
<td>Operators unable to recognise the potential for promotion of attractions outside of the strict LGA boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and staff in the local CVB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with CVB</td>
<td>Seven counties in the USA state of Florida</td>
<td>Funding structure and politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>executives in each county</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Competitive perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson and</td>
<td>In-depth interviews with tourism</td>
<td>Hunter Regional Tourism region on the central NSW coast</td>
<td>• Insufficient resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March (2008)</td>
<td>actors</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Power imbalances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Heterogeneous target markets and products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zbicz (1999)</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Various case study regions used as examples</td>
<td>Lack of buy-in/involvement of all scales of government in agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research. Sources cited within.
### Appendix C Timeline of Events Surrounding the NSW-QLD Border

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Able Tasman discovers Van Diemen’s Land (now Tasmania).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Captain James Cook discovers New South Wales (NSW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Commissioner John Bigge reports to Britain that it is becoming increasingly pressing for the colony of NSW to establish further settlements to transport 'intractable' NSW convicts. Port Curtis (now Gladstone, QLD) is suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>John Oxley leads the first detachment from the NSW colony to the north. First destination is Moreton Bay and then, after three months, the settlement moves to the banks of the Brisbane River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Following 16 years as a penal colony, Brisbane Town is declared a free settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>William Gladstone, Secretary of State, recognises being faced with an urgent issue of ‘intractable’ convicts in NSW (and Van Diemen’s Land). Again, Port Curtis (now Gladstone, QLD) is suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-9</td>
<td>Rev. Dr John Lang sends letters to the Honourable Earl Grey recommending the inclusion of a clause on the separation of colonies in an Act for the Better Government of Her Majesty's Australian Colonies. Lang, within his letters, argues that the 30th Parallel is the 'only proper point of separation between the two coterminous colonies'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>The Separation Act of 1850 is authorised. It includes an allowance for the separation of NSW to occur at the 30th parallel, as per the argument of Lang. The Act confirms that, based on a 'petition of the inhabitant householder', the Queen will detach territories above 30 degrees of south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>The first separation meeting is held in Drayton (now a suburb of Toowoomba, QLD) and led by Patrick Leslie and Arthur Hodges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>The Moreton Bay and Northern Rivers Districts Separation Association is formed. The organisation's objective is to secure northern separation, with Brisbane as the capital, and to continue using 'exiled' labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Two petitions lodged to Earl Grey regarding northern separation, with a letter from the Legislative Council of NSW explaining that a northern colony cannot financially support itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Following the receipt of the two petitions and the letter from the Legislative Council of NSW, Earl Grey responds saying that, while the petitions are enough for a separate colony to be established, the opposition from the Legislative Council suggests that separation is not wise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Lang details his recommendation to form seven provinces in Australia, including three in what is now the State of NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Following the failure of the previous petition, the Moreton Bay and Northern Districts Separation Association meets and lodges a further petition, based on the issues previously reported by the NSW Legislative Assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>The second petition lodged is rejected, with the comment that no instructions had been advised regarding the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>NSW Legislative Council makes changes in legislation to limit changes to the boundaries of the colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Rev. Dr Lang presents a petition representing Northern District residents, arguing for the establishment of a new colony north of the 30th parallel to be named Cooksland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>The Constitution Act of 1855 includes a clause providing the Legislative Council of NSW with some power to make decisions regarding colonial separation and boundary definition. The powers could still be overruled by the monarch, if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1855 Alarmed by the number of petitions, Sir William Denison, Governor of NSW, calls for a full report on the matter of separation. Henry Labouchere is asked to suggest a border other than the 30th parallel.

1855 The NSW Principle Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr Labouchere, writes to Sir William Denison suggesting the 28th and 29 parallels as the border of the new colony. This is said to traverse the MacPherson Range. The border is said to be evenly detrimental to both Brisbane and the Northern Rivers.

1855 Based on the arguments of the Legislative Council, that those living north of the Clarence River are 'almost unanimously earnestly desirous of annexation to Queensland', Lang argues that the Legislative Council 'consisted almost entirely of squatters, who wished merely to extend the squatting domain of NSW'.

1855 Edward Deas-Thomson, Colonial Secretary of NSW, writes to British Authorities suggesting the separation of the colony along the 30th parallel. It is argued that this will provide sufficient revenue for both NSW and the newly formed QLD colony. It is also suggested that any other border location would be met with great jealousy and discontentment by the colonists in the north.

1856 The Legislative Council of NSW is presented with a letter from the British Government stating that a decision has been made that separation of NSW will occur at the 30th parallel.

1856 A selected committee of the NSW Legislative Council provides objection to the announcement that the New England and Clarence River regions will be included in the new colony.

1858 In a private conference of 'gentlemen interested in the region', a map is prepared and dispatched to the Imperial Government.

1859 The new colony of QLD is officially established. On the suggestion of Queen Victoria, the new colony is named QLD and is established at the end of the year. The border is at 28°8' and begins at Point Danger on the coast.

1859 Pastoralists in the Northern Rivers region form the Grafton Improvement Association to lobby for further changes in the NSW colony.

1860 A public meeting is called in Grafton to discuss options regarding annexation to QLD and the separation of a new Northern Rivers colony.

1860 Lang writes that the decision of the NSW Parliament to determine the border at the location it did was to show neglect for the colonies in that a proper border was not provided.

1860 Lang presents the petitions for annexation of the Northern Rivers to QLD or the separation of the region to form a new colony - called 'New Cornwall'.

1860 33 to six votes in the Legislative Assembly against separation of Northern NSW. Three reasons are given for this: The Crown has already exhausted the powers provided in the special powers of the relevant Acts of Parliament; the separation would breach the promise of the Secretary of State for both colonies involved to agree to separation; and the loss of territory would not only be inexpedient but also highly injurious to the State of NSW.

1862 Colonial Secretary of NSW, Charlie Cowper, writes to his counterpart in QLD, Robert Herbert, to initiate a joint survey between Point Danger and the Dumaresq River.

1863 NSW appoints Isaiah Rowland and QLD appoints Francis Edward Roberts to jointly survey the common border. Each surveyor is given different instructions and the men have disagreements while completing the task.

1865 Augustus Gregory, QLD Surveyor-General and William Greaves, NSW District Surveyor of the Northern Rivers meet and agree on the 29th parallel as the border west of the previous determinations.

1866 Once both state surveyor reports have been provided, both State Governments recognise that the survey by Roberts is more accurate and accept that border.

1867 The Rockhampton League presents a petition calling for separation of Northern QLD from the southern part of the state at Dawes Range. They argue that the revenue of the north is being used exclusively by the south, leading the north into a downhill progression.

1871 The acting Governor of QLD sends a petition to Britain on behalf of the residents of North QLD, which argues that good government from Brisbane is impossible. The earl of Kimberly explains that he cannot advise the Queen on the matter.

1871 Lord Normanby arrives in QLD and undertakes his own review of the situation of North QLD. Despite recognising the general consensus for separation north of Dawes Range, he concludes that the period for separation has not arrived.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>John Macrossan enters the QLD Parliament and moves a motion for financial separation of the northern part of QLD, which is not supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>QLD Treasurer, James Dickson, produces a Bill to divide QLD for financial purposes. It does not pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Rockhampton Separation Movement presents a petition to Britain. It is unsuccessful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>John Cameron, Geodetic Surveyor NSW, and George Watson, QLD Surveyor, place markings every mile along the measured border along the 28° parallel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>North QLD Separation Movement presents a ten thousand-signature petition to Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>A letter by some North QLD residents addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies is made public. The letter contains arguments on the issue of separation and advocates black labour for the plantations. This causes the movement to gain a negative image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Premier Griffith writes to Britain explaining minimal interest in separation by the northern Queenslanders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Mackay plantation owners send a letter to British Authorities, with added comments from Lord Griffith diffusing the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Separation League in Townsville runs its own media campaign in England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Boulia Separation League sends a petition to the State Secretary of Colonies. They are informed they have no case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Northern Movement Committee sends another petition, which is, again, rejected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>Border fence erected along the NSW-QLD border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Australian Federation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Dr Earle Page and supporters persuade the Editor of the Tamworth newspaper, the Daily Observer to allow Page to publish his articles on separation for Northern NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Influenza epidemic results in the closure of the NSW borders to those crossing from South Australia and Victoria, while the QLD State Government closes the border to those crossing from NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Page has 11 articles published in the Daily Observer arguing for separation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Led by Page, the New England New State Movement begins. It is soon followed by the various northern press organisations agreeing to run a unit campaign on the separation issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>The Tamworth Municipal Council circulates an expression of interest to other northern councils to meet regarding the issue of separation. The press leagues and councillors meet in Glen Innes. A constitution and representative convention are established for the northern region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>An eighty-page booklet is produced by the Central Executive of the New England New State Movement and is referred to by supporters as 'The New State Booklet'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>220 delegates attend the New State convention in Armidale. It is decided that an organised campaign is needed for the petition to be supported. This process occurs throughout 1922.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Dr Page joins with the small Riverina Movement and an All Australian New State Movement Convention is held in Albury. It is found that each region has differing issues and hence the convention achieves little. The only common issue found is the tyranny of distance from Sydney and the lack of proper government administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-7</td>
<td>Promises made but never fulfilled by both State and Federal Governments to consider the issue of separation. Both scales of government agree to consider the issue of separation. Both suggest it is not of concern to their scale of government. In particular, the Federal Government says it is outside of its powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Judge Cohen is appointed to lead a Royal Commission into the New State Issue. Despite significant support in Northern NSW and minimal opposition in the region, a new colony in the region is not suggested. This is mainly on the grounds that it is neither practicable nor desirable since the region is not a financially self-supporting unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Bruce Hindmarsh attempts to fix the offshore boundary at Point Danger. He provides a map of the offshore boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>On the realisation that there is minimal support for new States in Australia, the New England New State Movement is abandoned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1929 Prof. Sir Peden's Commission into constitutional amendments recommends the amendment of the constitution to include a section that allows the Federal Government to erect a new state 'out of an existing state without the consent of the State Parliament'. Following a change in government, this amendment is never discussed in Parliament.

1935 A NSW Government commissioned report is published as the Nicholas Report and recommends that NSW be divided into three regions – northern, central and southern. It also recommends a referendum in the north to begin the process.

1948 Based on the findings and recommendations of the Nicholas Royal Commission on boundaries in Australia in 1935, the New England State Movement is revived.

1949-54 The New State Movement lobbies and petitions the NSW Legislative Assembly to no avail.

ca. 1954 The border fence and gates at Tweed Heads and Coolangatta are removed.

1953 Prime Minister Menzies is lobbied to set up a review of the constitution, to which he agrees. The request is granted, but never implemented.

1953 Coinciding with local government elections, 21 local governments in New England conduct a poll regarding the New State Issue. 77 percent of the population votes YES.

1954 Ulrich Ellis develops a submission titled 'An examination of the possible means for the attainment of self-government' and presents it to the Armidale convention of the New England State Movement. It is revised and then submitted again in Inverell to the same group. It advocates a 'Representative Assembly'.

1955 The first sitting of the newly formed New England Constituent Assembly takes place in Armidale. The Assembly has full legal powers to operate the Assembly and full constitutional powers to deliberate and pass its own Acts. It cannot enforce its decisions on the people of New England, however. The Assembly can request for the Acts to be re-enacted in NSW Parliament.

1955 The first Bill is passed by the newly formed New England Constituent Assembly and is sent to Premier John Cailhill, for movement in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly. The second Bill to be passed by the Constituents Assembly is titled the 'New England Development Bill'; it allows for the establishment of the New England Development Corporation, which aims to enhance industry development in the region.

1966 QLD Minister for Mines and Main Roads sends a letter to NSW Minister of Lands and Mines describing the offshore boundary. Surveying by both NSW and QLD continues.

1967 Based on the recommendations in the Nicholas Report, a State Referendum is held in NSW to consider the establishment of the new state of New England. Prior to the referendum, the government recognises that the referendum is likely to be successful and, as a result, re-draws the boundaries to include the Upper Hunter. Voters there are the critical tipping point in the referendum not being successful.

1967 Within a fortnight of the referendum being defeated, the New England State Movement focuses on amending the boundaries of the proposed state to better align with public sentiment, based on the results of the referendum. The group is no longer actively following this.

1980 A joint initiative of the NSW, QLD and Federal governments leads to the erection of a concrete structure marking the border at Point Danger.

1982 The Queensland Boundaries Declaration Act is passed and reinforces the concept that political boundaries are accepted as correct at the time of initial measurements, even if more advanced technology proves that they were incorrect.

2003 The NSW Farmers Association votes to examine the feasibility of establishing a new state – effectively the state of ‘Regional NSW’ – to counter the issue of government being metropolitan-focused, or ‘Sydney-centric’. The feasibility study is never released to the media.

2006 Northern NSW residents set up a website proposing new States in Australia by the end of 2010. The movement appears to have received limited attention.

2016 On 15 September, the QLD Parliament votes on the separation of Northern QLD from the south of the state. The motion is defeated 82 to three.

Source: Developed based on Bell (2006); Council Heritage Advisory Team (2011); Department of Finance and Deregulation (2008); Evening Post (1919); Foschia (2004); Lang (1850); Lewis (2005); Murphy (2005); Taylor (2006); Burke (2016); O'Brien (2016); Totaro (2003); Wiltshire (2006)