



Research paper

Comparing the perspectives of municipal tourism departments and cultural departments on urban cultural-tourism development

Sung-Ta Liu

Department of Tourism, Shih Hsin University, No. 111, Sec. 1, Muzha Rd., Wenshan Dist., 116, Taipei, Taiwan

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Urban tourism
Cultural tourism
Urban governance
Experts system
Analytic hierarchy process

ABSTRACT

This study assesses how the tourism and cultural sections of the public sector prioritize matters related to the development of urban cultural tourism. From the perspective of tourism planning, urban cultural tourism is a type of tourism that transforms the cultural assets of a city into tourist attractions. The cultural assets and tourism resources of a city may be managed by sectors with different standpoints regarding tourism development. The present study uses the Delphi method, an analytic hierarchy process, and nonparametric tests to explore how the tourism and cultural departments of five Taiwanese city governments rank the priority of related issues. The statistical results suggest that the tourism and cultural departments can reach a consensus regarding these matters because no adequate financial or even legitimizing support is offered by key decision makers at the central and municipal levels. In this light, a comprehensive master plan for urban cultural-tourism development will help the tourism and cultural sections of the public sector to undertake related projects.

1. Introduction

The development of cultural tourism in the last decade has benefited the conservation of a variety of tangible and intangible cultural assets. It has also aided the development of activities related to the arts, craftsmanship, and creativity (World Tourism Organization, 2016). Formerly, it was regarded as a form of tourism that targeted individuals with higher levels of education. However, culture has now become a popular tourism theme (du Cros & McKercher, 2015).

Cities are physical and spatial representations of human civilization. Therefore, tourism planners can identify cultural assets in a city and transform them into tourist attractions (du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Terzi, Türkoğlu, Bölen, Baran, & Salihoğlu, 2015). Indeed, since the 1980s, many postindustrial Western cities have used cultural entertainment activities to regenerate their urban areas: a phenomenon that is regarded as a form of culture-led tourism development (Pintilii, Merciu, Peptenatu, Cercleux, & Drăghci, 2011). This trend has prompted a growing number of studies on topics related to urban tourism (Williams, 1997).

The use of cultural assets for the purpose of tourism development has sparked several academic debates, including on the matter of whether the intangible values of cultural assets – such as those of their aesthetics, education, and history – can appropriately be conveyed while also attracting tourists (Calver & Page, 2013; du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Lee & Anderson, 2013;

Pătra;cu, 2013). Moreover, if the cultural assets are located in urban areas, then the public sector must also consider matters concerning urban and cultural tourism (du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Lee & Anderson, 2013; McManus & Carruthers, 2014; Scott, 2010; Terry & Smith, 2015).

As a result of related policies enforced by the central government, public sectors have implemented various cultural infrastructures, local community buildings, and creative industries in urban areas since the 1980s. Although the cultural department has avoided mentioning how these changes might influence the development of tourism in Taiwanese cities, both the tourism and cultural sections of the public sector have been required to manage matters related to the development of urban cultural tourism triggered by certain circumstances (Chien, Wu, & Lin, 2014; Hsieh, Huang, & Huang, 2011; Pan, Wang, & Lee, 2014).

Few studies have offered a systematic investigation of the perspectives of the tourism and cultural departments in the same municipal government regarding the management of matters concerning the development of urban cultural tourism. In light of this academic gap, the present study reviews the relevant literature and generates a theoretical framework for developing urban cultural tourism that consists of 20 problems with which the public sector is concerned. Moreover, by recruiting a panel of experts who have served in the tourism and cultural departments of Taiwanese city governments, the present study examines how experts in these two departments both assess the validity of 20 major problems and rank their priority. Thus, this study can enrich

E-mail address: stliu@mail.shu.edu.tw.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100432>

Received 3 July 2019; Received in revised form 28 February 2020; Accepted 14 March 2020

2212-571X/ © 2020 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

relevant research by not only identifying problems concerning the public-sector management of urban cultural-tourism development but also by adopting an empirical approach to investigate the possibility of achieving consensus between the tourism and cultural sections involved in urban cultural-tourism projects.

2. Literature review

2.1. Culture as a feature of urban tourism

The concept of cultural tourism was first introduced academically in the late 1970s, when researchers identified a niche market of tourists who preferred to experience cultural environments than to visit mass tourism locations (Smith, 1977; Tighe, 1986). Early literature regarded visiting physical historical attractions as the primary practice of cultural tourism. Since then, more studies have determined that intangible cultural assets, such as events and festivals, are also attractions that generate cultural tourism (Richards, 2001). Before the early 2010s, academic definitions of cultural tourism were based on types of tourism activities (Istoc, 2012). Yet du Cros & McKercher, 2015 proposed their definition based on the profession of tourism planners: cultural tourism is a form of tourism that transforms the cultural assets of a destination into tourist attractions.

A city is a space, suffused with culture, in which people gather during their everyday lives. Thus, a city can produce and conserve a variety of tangible and intangible cultural assets for tourism planners to transform into tourist attractions (McManus & Carruthers, 2014). Indeed, Jansen-Verbeke and Lievois (1999) suggested that cities are suitable platforms for cultural assets to become tourism resources. For example, a city that boasts several cultural assets is regarded by tourists as a destination at which they can gain a variety of experiences with less traveling time. Furthermore, cities possess the basic infrastructure, such as transportation systems, sanitation facilities, and even travel agencies, to support tourist access to cultural assets. Moreover, apart from its cultural assets, a city can offer other tourism options, such as shopping, hospitality, and food, to meet the multidimensional demands of tourists.

In 1986, Jansen-Verbeke argued that the cultural assets of a city, such as its museums, galleries, theaters, concerts, festivals, historical streets, monuments, religious buildings, heritage, and even local languages, are the primary elements that comprise urban tourism. Subsequent studies (e.g. Law, 2002; Ozus, Turk, & Dokmeci, 2011) have also emphasized that because they cannot be replicated, cultural assets are the key to increasing a city's competitiveness in the tourism market. Overall, cultural tourism is the driving force of contemporary urban tourism. In fact, academic studies on the topic of cultural tourism have gradually shifted empirical focus from cultural tourist attractions to cities (Smith, 2003).

2.2. Problems with urban cultural tourism

After cultural assets became tourist attractions, the question of whether tourism can convey the intangible qualities of cultural assets, such as their aesthetic, authenticity, and history has been raised (du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Throsby, 2001); however, some studies have agreed that the conservation of a cultural asset can receive wider attention and even support if the asset is a tourist attraction (Throsby, 2001; World Tourism Organization, 2016).

With the integration of cultural tourism into the tourism planning of a city, the question of how cultural tourism may cause other problems in the context of urban tourism must be considered, and vice versa. For example, because a city may have several cultural assets, it is debatable whether the public sector would merely promote certain culture assets and ignore others for the sake of tourism development (McCarthy, 2006). Generally, urban tourism planning is a task that concerns the public sector because it involves the establishment of infrastructure,

services, and policies that benefit not only tourists but also investors and residents (Law, 2002). Accordingly, this study appropriately promotes the value of cultural assets in the context of urban tourism. Moreover, the study offers a review of the relevant literature and indicates five other problems that concern public sectors: budgeting, human resources, sustainable development, marketing communications, and cross-sector coordination.

Regarding the matter of budgeting, it is clear that public sectors require an adequate financial base to undertake tourism development projects. The process by which public sectors acquire financial support from the private sectors when developing urban tourism is relatively complex because the public sector is more concerned with the public interest, whereas the private sector is more concerned with earning profit. Therefore, in many cases, apart from using their own taxation, the public sector must propose relevant projects, such as hosting international fairs, to acquire financial support from the central government or specific institutions (Law, 2002). In other cases, the public sector can increase their budget by selling their own souvenirs, food, and beverages (Hannigan, 1998).

The next matter is human resources. Usually, tourism requires a multitude of human-resource personnel to enable related work to be undertaken. Therefore, because of limited budgeting, public sectors may consider hiring volunteers, working with nonprofit organizations, and seeking advice from academics to achieve sufficient human resources (Law, 2002). Some may criticize the tourism industry for creating more entry-level jobs. Thus, the public sector should propose projects that create work opportunities that are reasonably paid, profession-oriented, and stable (Williams & Shaw, 1988). In the context of urban cultural tourism, this also means that the public sector must recruit not only conventional tourism planners but also professionals in the cultural sectors (Scott, 2010).

In terms of a city's sustainability, traffic jams, noise, sanitation problems, public security concerns, and other factors that affect tourism experiences and quality of life in a city will occur if no suitable tourism capacity management system is in place (Heath, 2007; Law, 2002; Terry & Smith, 2015). Moreover, in the context of urban cultural tourism, after a historic building block has been transformed into a cultural district, the prices and real estate value of the surrounding areas typically increase as a result of opportunists taking advantage of the increasing number of visitors and consumption. Therefore, the public sectors must ensure that the related markets are not manipulated by opportunists (McCarthy, 2005; Roodhouse, 2006). Compared with general entertainment facilities, such as shopping malls, sports fields and restaurants, cultural districts remain less attractive to consumers during weekdays. One possible solution is to increase the daily use of these transformed cultural assets by locals (Law, 2002; Marshall, 2012).

Regarding marketing communications, a general tactic employed by tourism planners for the purpose of providing potential tourists with an image of the city is to design and present the identification system of the city, such as a logo or slogan (Ward, 1998). The planners must possess adequate knowledge for using different media to deliver the image and travel information of the city to the target markets (Avraham, 2000). In the context of urban cultural tourism, different cultural assets suit different visitor segments. Hence, market segmentation and a combination of related promotion schemes and management strategies are crucial preparations for the public sector (Anholt, 2010; Calver & Page, 2013; du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Law, 2002; Lee & Anderson, 2013; Öztürk & Terhorst, 2012; Pătrașcu, 2013; Wilson & McIntosh, 2007). Additionally, compared with tourists, locals tend to be more concerned with whether the public sectors genuinely present the feature of a cultural asset that they have associated with that asset. Therefore, the public sector must communicate adequately with the locals in this respect (Choi, 2010; du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Grann, 2013; Kallus & Kolodney, 2010; Law, 2002).

Finally, for the public sector, cross-sector coordination is an

inevitable and crucial factor that affects the planning of urban tourism because the tourism resources of a city may be managed by a variety of stakeholders (Stevens, 2000). In the context of urban cultural tourism, furthermore, the public sector must attain the consensus of stakeholders on matters such as the ownership of an asset, how to use cultural assets as tourist attractions, and knowledge regarding the conservation of cultural assets (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Öztürk & Terhorst, 2012). In addition, cultural tourism and cultural asset management are related domains in theory and practice; however, some governmental systems differentiate between tourism and cultural sections. One observation indicated in the relevant literature is that the tourism section of the public sector tends to express more consideration for the tangible benefits of urban cultural tourism, such as economic growth, number of tourists, and revisiting rates, whereas the cultural counterparts are more concerned about the project's intangible benefits, such as conservation, educational opportunities, and identity building (Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Istoc, 2012; McManus & Carruthers, 2014).

2.3. Urban cultural tourism development in Taiwan

The Tourism Bureau, under the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, is the central competent authority in charge of Taiwan's tourism development. The Council for Cultural Affairs (CCA) is the central competent authority in charge of Taiwan's cultural conservation and promotion. Since the early 1990s, with the aim of promoting cultural autonomy and community-building at the local level, the CCA had encouraged Taiwanese cities and towns to develop arts and cultural locations and host related events (Lin & Li, 2010; Ministry of Culture, 2016).

A series of cultural policies implemented by the CCA not only reinforced local identity but also generated economic benefits (Ministry of Culture, 2016; Wang, 2016). Economic benefits were apparently derived from consumers who visited cultural centers and events. However, the CCA was reluctant to state that its cultural policies may have contributed to Taiwan's tourism development (Chen, 2005; Han, 2012; Ko, Chen, & Chuang, 2011; Lin & Li, 2010). The newly implemented cultural infrastructure in Taiwanese cities and towns also caused problems related to tourism management. For example, the increasing number of tourists had a negative effect on the locals in terms of the living environment (Chen, 2005). The concern that opportunistic businesspeople and politicians would abuse cultural assets was also raised (Yang, 2011).

In 2004, the Taiwanese central government planned to merge the Tourism Bureau and the CCA into a ministry-level institution. However, stakeholders in the two sections disapproved the proposal. Eventually, the Tourism Bureau remained under the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and the CCA was upgraded to the Ministry of Culture in 2012 (Chang, 2010; Ministry of Culture, 2016).

Notably, in the early 2000s, the Taiwanese central government began to promote cultural and creative industries (Ho, 2011). Therefore, many Taiwanese cities became enthusiastic about establishing arts and cultural spots, transforming historic sites into so-called cultural parks or cultural and creative industry districts, and hosting cultural events. However, problems associated with tourism began to affect Taiwanese cities, such as by decreasing the quality of living and causing a lack of consistent promotion (Pan et al., 2014).

In 2010, the central government legislated the Law for the Development of the Cultural and Creative Industries. The central competent authority under this law is the Ministry of Culture. The law defines several cultural activities as products of cultural and creative industries. Peculiarly, although the activities are regarded as cultural tourism activities, the law does not use any terms related to tourism or travel to refer to the activities (Chang, 2010).

The aforementioned information regarding the relationships between the tourism and cultural sections of the Taiwanese central government exemplifies the possible divergent perspectives of the two

sections regarding the role of cultural assets in tourism development. Furthermore, relevant studies have indicated that cross-sector coordination in the context of developing urban cultural tourism is relevant at the central government level as well as the local city level in Taiwan (Feng & Liu, 2014; Ho, 2011; Lin & Li, 2010). From the organizational management perspective, an organization should achieve the consensus of employees for effective organizational performance (Daft & Lengel, 1986; Daft, Lengel, & Trevino, 1987; Tushman & Nadler, 1978). Therefore, the manner in which tourism and cultural departments at the municipal level manage matters concerning urban cultural tourism in Taiwanese cities is intriguing.

2.4. Comparing the perspectives of the tourism and cultural sections

As mentioned, culture can be a driving force for the public sector to develop urban tourism. However, urban cultural tourism gives rise to problems that concern the public sector with regard to budgeting, human resources, the value of cultural assets, urban sustainability, marketing communications, and cross-sector coordination.

The development of Taiwan's urban cultural tourism was originally a consequence of the cultural development policies of the central government. Under these circumstances, the tourism and cultural sections seem to have divergent views regarding the use of the cultural assets of Taiwanese cities as tourist attractions. Nevertheless, the Taiwanese central government's intention to merge the Tourism Bureau and the CCA in 2004 suggests that the two sections may hold the same vision.

The cultural dimensions theory can be applied to look into the ambiguous relation between the tourism and cultural sections of Taiwan's public sectors. The theory applies relevant indexes to explain the influence of different societies' cultures on the values alongside the behavior of their respective members (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Furthermore, research has employed cultural dimensions theory to explain the behavior of Taiwan's public sectors. Low, Varughese, and Pang (2010) indicated that the Taiwanese central government was unable to implement certain policies because the social members have more nervous energy when sensing uncertain changes. According to that viewpoint, it can be suggested that the stakeholders of the tourism and cultural sections sensed uncertain changes resulting from the proposed organization merge. The subsequent disapproval by the concerned stakeholders then compelled the central government to revoke the proposal.

The potential merger between the two sections suggests that the Taiwanese central government recognized that both sections had similar duties owing to the execution of policies associated with tourism activities by the cultural sections.

Considering this context, Taiwan is a case worth studying to compare the tourism and cultural departments' views on urban cultural tourism affairs. Law (2002) suggested that large cities are more often able to offer diverse tourism activities because they usually play the role of the political, cultural, or economic centers of a nation. In Taiwan, six special municipalities of a certain population were chosen to exercise political, economic, cultural, and metropolitan functions: Taipei, New Taipei, Taoyuan, Taichung, Tainan, and Kaohsiung. By looking into the organizational structures of these cities, each city government separates the tourism department from the cultural department. Moreover, by reviewing the literature concerned with the urban cultural tourism of these six cities, research regarding the lack of cooperation and coordination in related projects of Taiwan's public sectors has been sparse and brief (e.g. Lin & Li, 2010); a systematic approach to comparing the perspectives of the tourism and cultural sections is still lacking. In light of this, Taiwanese cities are suitable for empirical research on this topic.

3. Methodology

Simon (1997) argued that an organization's prioritization of matters when intending to address complicated problems reflects its

management perspective. Considering this viewpoint, this study's empirical approach aimed to compare the perspectives of the tourism and cultural departments on the prioritization of matters that concern the urban cultural-tourism development of Taiwanese cities. More specifically, the first step was to identify these topics through a literature review. Thereafter, this study employed the Delphi method by consulting stakeholders in the tourism and cultural departments of major Taiwanese cities to confirm the relevance of various topics. Thereafter, an analytic hierarchy process (AHP) was employed to examine the departments' prioritization of the confirmed topics. Finally, nonparametric statistics were applied to compare the departments' perspectives on prioritization.

The AHP and Delphi methods were the crucial data-collection techniques in this study's empirical approach. Moreover, application of the AHP revealed the number of stakeholders from the tourism and cultural departments. The following paragraphs describe the AHP and the manner in which the Delphi method was applied.

AHP is a technique for examining how an individual or organization makes a decision when confronted with multiple solutions for various problems. It works by establishing an expert system for investigating the respective weight of a group of variables relevant to the research subject. Thus, AHP involves a survey design and experts (Armitage & Colton, 2005). The present study articulated three conditions for selecting the experts invited to join the panel. First, the experts work in the tourism or cultural departments of the city governments of the Taiwanese special municipalities. Second, the experts have participated in urban cultural-tourism projects. Finally, the experts have experience in management roles in related projects.

When conducting AHP, it is recommended that five to 20 experts be invited to join the expert panel (Duke & Aull-Hyde, 2002). Invitations were issued to each city government in October 2017. By the end of 2017, 12 panel members from five Taiwanese city governments had been confirmed. Six of them were from tourism departments, and the remainder were from cultural departments. Table 1 lists the numbers of panel members from each department.

As mention previously, before the AHP was executed, the Delphi method was applied to ask the panelists to evaluate the issues concerning the urban cultural-tourism development of Taiwanese cities. The Delphi method is a technique that uses repetitive surveys to systematically collect the opinions of a group of experts on a particular research topic (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). Through a literature review, this study identified 20 topics and classified them into the following six categories: budgeting, human resources, the value of cultural assets, urban sustainability, marketing communications, and cross-sector coordination. A survey conducted in January 2018 required the panel members to judge the content validity of the textual expressions of the topics and categories according to their work experience. The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale with points ranging from 1 (very irrelevant) to 5 (very relevant) to collect the opinions of the panelists. The panel members were permitted to suggest amendments to the content and even to the hierarchy model itself formed by the categories

Table 1
List of panel members.

City Government	Department	Number of Panel member(s)
Taipei	Department of Information and Tourism	1
	Department of Cultural Affairs	2
New Taipei	Tourism & Travel Department	3
	Cultural Affairs Department	1
Taoyuan	Department of Tourism	1
	Department of Cultural Affairs	1
Taichung	Cultural Affairs Bureau	1
Tainan	Tourism Bureau	1
	Cultural Affairs Bureau	1

and problems. Necessary changes were made based on the suggestions of the panelists, and the questionnaire for the next round was then generated. For the survey in the first round, rather than asking the panelists to provide scores for the textual expressions of the six categories, an open-ended question was used to determine required changes to the hierarchy model. This was done to avoid changing the model so dramatically that panelists would be distracted from assessing the content.

4. Results and discussion

According to Faherty (1979), when the interquartile range (IQR) of the scores of a Delphi survey question given to experts is less than or equal to 1.00, then a consensus has been reached. Furthermore, Murry and Hammons (1995) suggested that when 80% of experts do not intend to change their answers or provide opinions on a Delphi survey question, then their answers have reached stability. Moreover, following research design employed by Min (2016), the mean score of each item in the present study was required to be higher than 3.50 for its relevance to the concerns of public sectors regarding urban cultural-tourism development to be confirmed.

Based on the aforementioned study, the current study completed the Delphi surveys after collecting and analyzing the third-round questionnaire at the end of March 2018. In the first-round survey, none of the panelists expressed opinions regarding the hierarchy model formed according to the specified categories and problems, the final version of which is listed in the appendix, with their original references. Table 2 presents the statistical outcomes of the Delphi surveys.

The study then used the confirmed hierarchy model to conduct the AHP survey. The questionnaire was designed using a nine-point pairwise comparison scale to ask the 12 panelists to decide whether one of the two categories or the concerns had a higher priority and discern the difference between them. The consistency ratio (CR) was calculated by applying the following equation introduced by Alonso and Lamata (2006), where λ_{max} is the largest eigenvalue. CR was required to be less than 10% for the consistency of the priority ratio given by the panelists to be approved.

$$CR = \frac{\lambda_{max} - N}{2.7699 N - 4.3513 - N}$$

The AHP data were collected in June 2018. The present study used the Microsoft Excel template composed by Goepel (2013) to generate the overall statistical results. Table 3 presents the CRs of the answers from each panel to the pairwise comparison survey. Consistency was confirmed because all of the CRs were less than 10%.

The study used Friedman testing, a nonparametric test technique, to determine whether each concern was given significantly different weights on the six occasions, which referred to the six panelists of either the tourism or the cultural department. Because multiple comparisons were conducted, the Bonferroni correction was applied to identify the corrected significance level, which was $0.05/6 = 0.008$.

The results of Friedman testing, as presented in Table 4, suggested that no significant difference existed between the rankings of the 20 concerns provided by the tourism panelists ($p = .025 > 0.008$). Moreover, no significant differences were observed between the rankings given by the cultural panelists ($p = .739 > 0.008$).

The study then merged the data into two groups. Table 5 presents the prioritization weights of each category and concern for each of the six tourism panelists, and Table 6 presents the corresponding perspectives of the cultural panelists.

Wilcoxon signed ranks testing, a nonparametric test technique, was used to examine whether the sets of weights of the 20 concerns given by the tourism and cultural panelists differed significantly. The results, as presented in Table 7, suggested that no significant difference existed ($p = .601 > 0.05$).

Table 2
Statistical results of the Delphi surveys.

Concern	First Round			Second Round			Third Round		
	M	IQR	Stability (%)	M	IQR	Stability (%)	M	IQR	Stability (%)
A0	–	–	–	4.75	0.25	83.3	4.83	0.00	100.0
A1	4.00	1.25	41.7	4.17	0.25	91.7	4.67	0.25	100.0
A2	2.83	2.00	33.3	4.17	1.25	75.0	4.50	1.00	91.7
A3	3.58	1.00	41.7	4.50	1.00	83.3	4.67	1.00	100.0
B0	–	–	–	4.58	1.00	83.3	4.75	0.00	100.0
B1	4.50	1.00	83.3	4.67	1.00	100.0	4.75	0.25	100.0
B2	4.42	1.00	75.0	4.58	1.00	100.0	4.67	0.25	100.0
B3	4.50	1.00	91.7	4.42	1.00	75.0	4.83	0.00	100.0
B4	3.92	2.00	66.7	4.00	1.25	75.0	4.33	1.00	91.7
C0	–	–	–	4.67	0.25	100.0	4.83	0.00	100.0
C1	4.50	1.00	75.0	4.67	0.25	100.0	4.83	0.00	100.0
C2	3.42	1.25	66.7	4.83	0.00	100.0	4.83	0.00	100.0
C3	4.33	1.00	66.7	4.33	1.00	91.7	4.75	0.00	100.0
D0	–	–	–	4.08	2.00	66.7	4.58	0.25	91.7
D1	4.42	1.25	58.3	4.67	0.25	100.0	4.67	0.25	100.0
D2	4.42	1.00	66.7	4.50	1.00	91.7	4.67	0.25	100.0
D3	3.67	2.25	75.0	4.58	1.00	91.7	4.67	0.25	100.0
E0	–	–	–	4.58	0.25	83.3	4.75	0.00	100.0
E1	4.42	1.00	91.7	4.58	1.00	83.3	4.75	0.25	100.0
E2	4.33	1.25	75.0	4.33	1.00	91.7	4.75	0.00	100.0
E3	3.50	1.25	58.3	4.33	1.00	91.7	4.75	0.00	100.0
E4	4.00	2.00	91.7	4.42	1.00	91.7	4.67	0.25	100.0
F0	–	–	–	4.25	1.00	91.7	4.75	0.25	100.0
F1	4.33	1.25	83.3	4.17	1.25	91.7	4.58	1.00	100.0
F2	4.08	1.00	58.3	4.17	0.25	83.3	4.75	0.25	100.0
F3	4.00	0.25	58.3	4.50	1.00	100.0	4.75	0.00	100.0

5. Conclusions

This study employed the Delphi method, an AHP, and nonparametric tests to investigate the perspectives of the tourism and cultural departments of Taiwanese city governments regarding concerns related to the development of urban cultural tourism. Relevant studies have suggested that individuals in tourism and cultural sections have divergent perspectives (e.g. du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Istoc, 2012; McManus & Carruthers, 2014; Throsby, 2001). However, the statistical results of this study revealed no significant difference between the priority rankings of the two departments regarding these concerns.

From an assessment of the results presented in Tables 6 and 7, it can be discerned that the two departments have the same priority ranking for six categories consisting of 20 concerns. The category of ‘Central, local, and nongovernmental resource integration and collaboration’ (F0) was ranked as the top priority. The other categories were ranked as follows: ‘Communication, marketing, and management of local cultural tourism’ (E0), ‘Preserve and activate cultural highlights to promote cultural values’ (D0), ‘Effective use, cultivation, and expansion of

Table 3
CRs of the AHP survey.

Panel Code/City/Department	CR						
	A0 to F0	A1 to A3	B1 to B4	C1 to C3	D1 to D3	E1 to E4	F1 to F3
1/Taipei/Tourism	9.8%	8.4%	4.2%	4.0%	6.8%	9.7%	4.0%
2/New Taipei/Tourism	8.0%	8.4%	2.5%	6.8%	6.8%	7.3%	6.8%
3/New Taipei/Tourism	9.5%	6.8%	5.1%	6.8%	6.8%	7.5%	0.0%
4/New Taipei/Tourism	9.6%	0.7%	8.3%	0.7%	6.8%	6.9%	0.0%
5/Taoyuan/Tourism	8.8%	8.4%	4.3%	4.0%	6.8%	9.7%	3.0%
6/Tainan/Tourism	8.9%	3.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%
7/Taipei/Culture	8.9%	4.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%
8/Taipei/Culture	8.9%	4.0%	3.8%	4.0%	4.0%	5.7%	0.0%
9/New Taipei/Culture	0.0%	3.0%	5.7%	8.4%	8.4%	8.3%	0.0%
10/Taoyuan/Culture	8.9%	6.8%	9.7%	4.0%	0.0%	5.7%	4.0%
11/Taichung/Culture	8.3%	4.0%	2.8%	6.8%	0.0%	5.7%	6.8%
12/Tainan/Culture	9.4%	3.0%	8.0%	3.0%	3.0%	5.1%	3.0%

Table 4
Friedman testing results.

N	χ^2	df	p	Panel Code/City/Department	Mean Rank
20	12.827	5	.025	1/Taipei/Tourism	3.65
				2/New Taipei/Tourism	3.20
				3/New Taipei/Tourism	2.68
				4/New Taipei/Tourism	4.65
				5/Taoyuan/Tourism	3.58
				6/Tainan/Tourism	4.65
20	2.747	5	.739	7/Taipei/Culture	3.80
				8/Taipei/Culture	3.45
				9/New Taipei/Culture	3.50
				10/Taoyuan/Culture	3.63
				11/Taichung/Culture	2.93
				12/Tainan/Culture	3.70

human resources’ (C0), ‘Effective use, cultivation, and expansion of human resources’ (B0), and ‘Budgeting and securing project funds’ (A0).

Regarding the 20 concerns, both departments recognized the same three concerns as having the lowest priorities: ‘Obtain project funds or

Table 5
Weights of the AHP results from the tourism panelists.

Category	Weight	Rank	Concern	Weight within Category	Rank within Category	Global Weight	Global Rank
A0	4.6%	6	A1	13.6%	3	0.6%	20
			A2	36.0%	2	1.7%	14
			A3	50.4%	1	2.3%	12
B0	7.0%	5	B1	10.1%	4	0.7%	19
			B2	14.7%	3	1.0%	18
			B3	28.5%	2	2.0%	13
			B4	46.6%	1	3.3%	10
C0	10.9%	4	C1	10.5%	3	1.1%	17
			C2	22.3%	2	2.4%	11
			C3	67.2%	1	7.3%	6
D0	18.5%	3	D1	8.8%	3	1.6%	15
			D2	25.3%	2	4.7%	7
			D3	65.9%	1	12.2%	4
E0	26.9%	2	E1	5.6%	4	1.5%	16
			E2	13.4%	3	3.6%	9
			E3	28.5%	2	7.7%	5
			E4	52.5%	1	14.1%	2
F0	32.2%	1	F1	11.5%	3	3.7%	8
			F2	38.5%	2	12.4%	3
			F3	50.0%	1	16.1%	1

Table 6
Weights of the AHP results from the cultural panelists.

Category	Weight	Rank	Concern	Weight within Category	Rank within Category	Global Weight	Global Rank
A0	8.3%	6	A1	13.5%	3	1.1%	20
			A2	30.2%	2	2.5%	15
			A3	56.2%	1	4.7%	10
B0	11.2%	5	B1	10.7%	4	1.2%	19
			B2	17.7%	3	2.0%	18
			B3	26.9%	2	3.0%	13
			B4	44.8%	1	5.0%	8
C0	14.5%	4	C1	16.1%	3	2.3%	16
			C2	27.0%	2	3.9%	11
			C3	56.8%	1	8.2%	4
D0	18.8%	3	D1	16.1%	3	3.0%	13
			D2	39.2%	2	7.4%	5
			D3	44.7%	1	8.4%	3
E0	23.0%	2	E1	10.2%	4	2.3%	16
			E2	15.5%	3	3.6%	12
			E3	23.9%	2	5.5%	7
			E4	50.4%	1	11.6%	2
F0	24.3%	1	F1	20.7%	3	5.0%	8
			F2	29.4%	2	7.1%	6
			F3	49.9%	1	12.1%	1

Table 7
Wilcoxon signed ranks testing results.

Culture Weights – Tourism Weights	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Negative ranks (culture < tourism)	5	16.40	82.00
Positive ranks (culture > tourism)	14	7.71	108.00
Ties (culture = tourism)	1	–	–
Total	20	–	–

Z = -.523; p = .601 > .05

resources through budgeting, lobbying for parliamentary support, applying for central government subsidies, and collaborating with private companies' (A1), 'Recruit and train volunteers and establish voluntary organizations for project promotion or execution' (B1), and 'Obtain professional human resources to provide suggestions for the project and the subsequent execution by signing contracts with private companies, initiating industry-academia collaboration, consulting scholars and other experts, or requesting assistance, such as administrative

assistance, from other professional agencies (e.g. activity planning and execution, project selection, and researching)' (B2).

Both of the departments recognized two concerns as having the highest priorities: 'Conduct research on cultural highlights to enable the cultural assets to attract the appropriate customer base, thereby systematically preserving and promoting the cultural assets and achieving balanced, mutual development' (E4) and 'Assist in counselling private organizations (e.g. enterprises, temples, and corporate bodies) to ensure that they understand their rights and responsibilities, benefits, and restrictions with regard to the utilization of cultural assets by conforming with existing laws and regulations as well as establish a partnership by examining responses to the media' (F3).

To explore the reasons behind these results, brief interviews were conducted with the 12 panelists to ask for their opinions regarding the statistical results. The panelists offered a similar explanation of the results. Regarding concern A1, which had one of the lowest priorities, the panelists expressed the view that politicians at the levels of the central and municipal government were key people who exercised an influence on the allocation of financial support to specific urban cultural-tourism projects. Therefore, despite being the real executors of the relevant projects, the experts on the panels did not recognize the priority of concern A1.

Regarding concerns B1 and B2, the panelists stated that the leading decision makers did not have a comprehensive understanding of how cultural assets can be the significant driving force of urban tourism. The coexistence of tourism departments and cultural departments within the Taiwanese city governments is proof of this fact. Notwithstanding the implementation of many urban cultural-tourism projects, the number of comprehensive long-term master tourism plans available for consultation by both departments is insufficient. As a result, although the panelists generally acknowledged the value of adequate human resources for the development of urban cultural tourism, they indicated that these were not their major concerns in the long term.

The lack of a comprehensive plans for the development of urban cultural tourism is also a reason for the focus on concerns E4 and F3. The reason for this is that without the legitimating support of relevant master plans from the central or city governments, the panelists were required to invest more time in considering whether and how to use cultural assets for leisure, recreational, or tourism purposes.

As mentioned, Taiwanese culture avoids uncertainty (Hofstede et al., 2010; Low et al., 2010). Accordingly, the central government was unable to merge the tourism and cultural sections that hold the same mission. The current study demonstrated that with the unattained organization merge, the executors of the two departments had to confront problems related to urban cultural tourism without financial or even legitimizing support.

Meanwhile, the present study revealed that the tourism and cultural departments statistically had similar views on the priority rankings concerned with urban cultural tourism affairs. However, other case studies have suggested that the two counterparts have divergent perspectives (e.g. du Cros & Mc Kercher, 2015; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Istoc, 2012; McManus & Carruthers, 2014; Throsby, 2001). The study findings reflect the premise of organizational information processing theory, which follows that internal information processing significantly influence an organization's performance. For effective information processing, people within the organization eventually develop a similar understanding when managing tasks at work (Daft et al., 1987). Although individuals working in the tourism and cultural departments of Taiwanese cities might have different perspectives on urban cultural tourism, the divergent views are reconciled to a certain degree when the individuals manage relevant tasks at work.

Overall, this study presents a theoretical framework and research design for examining the concerns of the public sector regarding the development of urban cultural tourism and identified 20 topics related to these concerns that could be categorized into six categories: budgeting, human resources, the value of cultural assets, urban sustainability,

marketing communications, and cross-sector coordination. Furthermore, the case study of Taiwanese cities highlights that culture is largely inseparable from urban tourism despite the power separation of the tourism and cultural departments. Thus, legitimizing long-term plans for the development of urban cultural tourism will enable leading executors to efficiently transform the cultural assets of a city into tourism attractions. The consensus of the two departments regarding the priority rankings of these matters can be a reference for the creation of related master plans.

Author contribution

Sung-Ta Liu: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data curation, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing, Visualization, Project administration, Funding acquisition

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan (MOST 106-2410-H-128-028-).

Appendix A

- Category A0: Budgeting and securing project funds.
 - Concern A1: Obtain project funds or resources through budgeting, lobbying for parliamentary support, applying for central government subsidies, and collaborating with private companies (Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Law, 2002).
 - Concern A2: Acquire funding or annual revenue that supports the project through creative derivative services, such as leasing venues, event planning, ticket sales, souvenirs, and catering (Hannigan, 1998; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010).
 - Concern A3: Directly or indirectly raise funds or seek sponsorship from private companies for project execution. For example, raising funds from private companies through foundations or allowing contractors to seek sponsorship themselves with the consent of the organizer (Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Law, 2002).
- Category B0: Effective use, cultivation, and expansion of human resources.
 - Concern B1: Recruit and train volunteers and establish voluntary organizations for project promotion or execution (Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Law, 2002).
 - Concern B2: Obtain professional human resources to provide suggestions for the project and the subsequent execution by signing contracts with private companies, initiating industry-academia collaboration, consulting scholars and other experts, or requesting assistance, such as administrative assistance, from other professional agencies (e.g. activity planning and execution, project selection, and researching) (Law, 2002).
 - Concern B3: Implement planned, systematic, and long-term professional talent cultivation and education in public-sector organizations (Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Scott, 2010).
 - Concern B4: Create long-term and skill-based job opportunities while promoting urban cultural tourism development through charted business operations (e.g. build-operate-transfer, rehabilitate-operate-transfer, and operate-transfer) (Williams & Shaw, 1988).
- Category C0: Maintain the sustainability of urban cultural tourism environment.
 - Concern C1: Establish recreational carrying capacity and the capacity to maintain the visiting rates of tourists or develop measures to prevent traffic, noise, sanitation issues, public safety concerns, and landscape and environmental problems caused by an increased number of tourists (Chen, 2005; Heath, 2007; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Law, 2002; Pan et al., 2014; Terry & Smith, 2015).
 - Concern C2: Reduce unfair competition in local markets caused by cultural-tourism development (e.g. an upsurge in housing and commercial rental prices or malicious retail pricing) (Law, 2002; Roodhouse, 2006).
 - Concern C3: Acquire the recognition of local residents in advance when planning relevant infrastructure, services, and activities, and allow the residents to enjoy priority use of these facilities, services, and activities or special offers, thereby promoting public participation to enable the characteristics of cultural-tourism resources to be more reflective of the location (Law, 2002; Marschall, 2012).
- Category D0: Preserve and activate cultural highlights to promote cultural values.
 - Concern D1: Plan cultural-tourism-related infrastructure, services, and activities in accordance with the following goals: preserve and utilize cultural assets, maintain the overall environment, and attract public participation (du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Ho, 2011; McCarthy, 2005).
 - Concern D2: With relevant tourism infrastructure, services, or activities, tangible and intangible cultural assets (e.g. monuments, historical buildings, memorial buildings, settlements, archaeological sites, historical sites, cultural landscapes, antiquities, natural landscapes, natural monuments, traditional performing arts, traditional crafts, oral traditions, folk customs, and traditional knowledge and practices) can be utilized to promote cultural values (e.g. aesthetics, spirituality, society, history, symbolism, truth, and science) (du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Throsby, 2001).
 - Concern D3: Avoid allocating resources to only a select few cultural assets to reduce the disruption to these assets while also highlighting the uniqueness of other cultural assets (McCarthy, 2006).
- Category E0: Communication, marketing, and management of local cultural tourism.
 - Concern E1: Organize cultural exchanges and briefings or conduct field surveys to understand the cultural highlights that local residents believe truly reflect the cultural and historical background of the region (Choi, 2010; Grann, 2013; Kallus & Kolodney, 2010).
 - Concern E2: Establish an identification system, such as signs or posters, and plan and implement various communication projects to create a cultural settlement and tourism brand image for the city (Anholt, 2010; Avraham, 2000; Law, 2002; Ward, 1998).
 - Concern E3: Use cultural highlights through diverse promotion methods (e.g. events, guided tours, and special offers) to attract potential tourists and repeat visitors (Calver & Page, 2013; du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Lee & Anderson, 2013; Pan et al., 2014; Pătrașcu, 2013; Wilson & McIntosh, 2007).
 - Concern E4: Conduct research on cultural highlights to enable the cultural assets to attract the appropriate customer base, thereby systematically preserving and promoting the cultural assets and achieving balanced, mutual development (du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Lee & Anderson, 2013; Öztürk & Terhorst, 2012).
- Category F0: Central, local, and nongovernmental resource integration and collaboration.
 - Concern F1: Communicate, coordinate, and collaborate with the management of each tourism business, and consider factors such as life, production, and ecology to develop a holistic and systematic cultural-tourism development plan (e.g. regional tourism, themed tourism, seasonal travel, activities, and festivals) (Lin & Li, 2010; Stevens, 2000).
 - Concern F2: Understand the common interests of the preservers, managers, and maintainers of cultural assets and other

stakeholders to integrate the perspectives of cultural-asset preservation and utilization with tourism-industry development through such elements as intellectual property rights, the effects of tourism, open management, revenues and royalties, financial assessments, and the self-liquidation ratio (du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Feng & Liu, 2014; Ho, 2011; Hughes & Carlsen, 2010; Istoc, 2012; McManus & Carruthers, 2014).

■ **Concern F3:** Assist in counselling private organizations (e.g. enterprises, temples, and corporate bodies) to ensure that they understand their rights and responsibilities, benefits, and restrictions with regard to the utilization of cultural assets by conforming with existing laws and regulations as well as establish a partnership by examining responses to the media (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; du Cros & McKercher, 2015; Öztürk & Terhorst, 2012).

References

- Alonso, J. A., & Lamata, M. T. (2006). Consistency in the analytic hierarchy process: A new approach. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 14(4), 445–459.
- Anholt, S. (2010). *Place: Identity, image and reputation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Analytic hierarchy process. In P. Armitage, & T. Colton (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of biostatistics*. New Jersey, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Avraham, E. (2000). Cities and their news media images. *Cities*, 17, 363–370.
- Calver, S., & Page, S. (2013). Enlightened hedonism: Exploring the relationship of service vale, visitor knowledge and interest to visitor enjoyment at heritage attractions. *Tourism Management*, 39, 23–36.
- Chang, Y. C. (2010). The conjunction of cultural creative industries and cultural tourism. *The Journal of Regional and Social Development Research*, 1, 249–265.
- Chen, K. H. (2005). A study of community residents' attitudes on the impact of urban tourism: A case study from Anping district in Tainan city. *Journal of Architecture and Planning*, 6(2), 109–127.
- Chien, H. C., Wu, L. S., & Lin, Y. H. (2014). Visitor's tourism cognition in five-harbor (Goü tiäu Kanğ) cultural area. *Journal of Tungfang Design University*, 35, 113–122.
- Choi, J. D. (2010). The palace, the city and the past: Controversies surrounding the re-building of the Gyeongbok Palace in Seoul, 1990–2010. *Planning Perspectives*, 25(2), 193–213.
- Cohen, E., & Cohen, S. (2012). Authentication: Hot and cold. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(3), 1295–1314.
- du Cros, H., & McKercher, B. (2015). *Cultural tourism* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science*, 32(5), 554–571.
- Daft, R. L., Lengel, R. H., & Trevino, L. K. (1987). Message equivocality, media selection, and manager performance: Implications for information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 11(3), 355–366.
- Dalkey, N., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, 9(3), 458–467.
- Duke, J. M., & Aull-Hyde, R. (2002). Identifying public preferences for land preservation: Using the analytic hierarchy process. *Ecological Economics*, 42, 131–145.
- Faherty, V. (1979). Continuing social work education: Results of a Delphi survey. *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 15(1), 12–19.
- Feng, H. Y., & Liu, F. J. (2014). The denotation and trend of cultural tourism. *Journal of National United University*, 11(1), 1–25.
- Goepel, K. D. (2013). Implementing the analytic hierarchy process as a standard method for multi-criteria decision making in corporate enterprises: A new AHP Excel template with multiple inputs. *Proceedings of the international symposium on the analytic hierarchy process, Kuala Lumpur 2013*.
- Grann, A. (2013). Counterfeiting the nation? Skopje 2014 and the politics of nation building in Macedonia. *Cultural Anthropology*, 28(1), 161–179.
- Han, H. L. (2012). Culture, industry, and tourism—A study on the dietary and tourism environment of Jiufen. *Journal of Island Tourism Research*, 5(4), 24–44.
- Hannigan, J. (1998). *Fantasy city: Pleasure and profit in the postmodern metropolis*. London: Routledge.
- Heath, T. (2007). The twenty-four hour city concept: A review of initiatives in British cities. *Journal of Urban Design*, 2(2), 193–204.
- Ho, P. C. (2011). A developmental strategy for cultural tourism in Tainan, Lukang and Monga. *Journal of Design Science*, 6(2), 73–91.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hsieh, C. C., Huang, C. Y., & Huang, C. F. (2011). The environmental reform and tourist satisfaction improvement strategies of public cultural tourism resources: A case study of Taichung Confucius Temple Park. *Journal of Physical Education and Leisure, Ling Tung University*, 9, 79–93.
- Hughes, M., & Carlsen, J. (2010). The business of cultural heritage tourism: Critical success factors. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 5(1), 17–32.
- Istoc, E.-M. (2012). Urban cultural tourism and sustainable development. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 1(1), 38–56.
- Jansen-Verbeke, M. (1986). Inner-city tourism: Resources, tourists and promoters. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(1), 79–100.
- Jansen-Verbeke, M., & Lievois, E. (1999). Analysing heritage resource for urban tourism in European cities. In P. Pearce, & R. Butler (Eds.). *Cultural issues in tourism development* (pp. 81–107). London: CAB International.
- Kallus, R., & Kolodney, Z. (2010). Politics of urban space in an ethno-nationally contested city: Negotiating (co)existence in Wadi Nisnas. *Journal of Urban Design*, 15(3), 403–422.
- Ko, J. C., Chen, K. L., & Chuang, O. L. J. (2011). The effects of the agriculture cultural experiencing activities designed with the benefits-based management principle: A case study of the demonstrating leisure agricultural areas in Yilan county. *Ilan University Journal of Bioresources*, 7(1), 7–18.
- Law, M. L. (2002). *Urban tourism: The visitor economy and the growth of large cities*. London: Continuum.
- Lee, J. Y., & Anderson, C. D. (2013). The resorted Cheonggyecheon and the quality of life in Seoul. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 20(4), 3–22.
- Lin, Y. D., & Li, C. S. (2010). The strategy of shaping Great Nanhai cultural living circles. *Journal of Community Research*, 1, 71–111.
- Low, Y. S.-Y., Varughese, J., & Pang, A. (2010). Communicating crisis: How culture influences image repair in Western and Asia governments. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(3), 218–242.
- Marschall, S. (2012). Sustainable heritage tourism: The Inanda Heritage Route and the 2010 FIFA World cup. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(5), 721–736.
- McCarthy, J. (2005). Promoting image and identity in cultural quarters: The case of Dundee. *Local Economy*, 20(3), 280–293.
- McCarthy, J. (2006). The application of policy for cultural clustering: Current practice in Scotland. *European Planning Studies*, 14(3), 397–408.
- McManus, C., & Carruthers, C. (2014). Cultural quarters and urban regeneration: The case of cathedral quarter Belfast. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 20(1), 78–98.
- Min, J. C. H. (2016). Guiding the guides: Developing indicators of tour guides' service quality. *Total Quality Management*, 27(9), 1043–1062.
- Ministry of Culture (2016). http://english.moc.gov.tw/content_83.html/, Accessed date: 13 June 2019.
- Murry, J. W., & Hammons, J. O. (1995). Delphi: A versatile methodology for conducting qualitative research. *The Review of Higher Education*, 18(4), 423–436.
- Öztürk, H. E., & Terhorst, P. (2012). Variety of urban tourism development trajectories: Antalya, Amsterdam and Liverpool compared. *European Planning Studies*, 20(4), 665–683.
- Ozuz, E., Turk, S. S., & Dokmeci, V. (2011). Urban restructuring of Istanbul. *European Planning Studies*, 19(2), 331–356.
- Pan, Y. P., Wang, S. C., & Lee, C. B. (2014). Reuse of space, clustering effect and the impact of surrounding tourism of cultural and creative industry park: The case study of Taichung cultural and creative industry park. *Journal of Tourism and Travel Research*, 9(1), 29–52.
- Pintilii, R. D., Merciu, F. C., Peptenatu, D., Cercleux, A. L., & Drăghci, C. C. (2011). Sports and leisure time tourism: A way of revitalizing emergent spaces from the metropolitan area of bucharest. *Analele Universității Din Oradea: Seria Geografie*, 2, 323–332.
- Pătrașcu, C. (2013). Media and branding strategies in cultural tourism: The case of the region of Moldavia. *Public Administration & Regional Studies*, 2(12), 43–52.
- Richards, G. (Ed.). (2001). *Cultural attractions and European tourism*. Wallingford: CAB International.
- Roodhouse, S. (2006). *Cultural quarters principle and practices*. Bristol: Intelligent Books.
- Scott, A. J. (2010). The cultural economy of landscape and prospects for peripheral development in the twenty-first century: The case of the English Lake District. *European Planning Studies*, 18(10), 1567–1589.
- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Smith, V. L. (1977). Introduction. In V. L. Smith (Ed.). *Hosts and guests* (pp. 1–20). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, M. K. (2003). *Issues in cultural tourism studies*. London: Routledge.
- Stevens, T. (2000). The future of visitor attractions. *Travel and Tourism Intelligence*, 1, 61–85.
- Terry, W., & Smith, C. A. (2015). Charleston, South Carolina: From Holy City to static city-historic preservation, and the cruise ship controversy. *Focus on Geography*, Fall, 121–137.
- Terzi, F., Türkoğlu, H. D., Bölen, F., Baran, P. K., & Salihoğlu, T. (2015). Residents' perception of cultural activities as quality of life in Istanbul. *Social Indicators Research*, 122, 211–234.
- Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tighe, A. J. (1986). The arts/tourism partnership. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24(3), 2–5.
- Tushman, M. L., & Nadler, D. A. (1978). Information processing as an integrating concept in organizational design. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(3), 613–624.
- Wang, I. H. (2016). Discussing the issues of the tourism aesthetic: From the aspect of building tourism communities. *Journal of Tungfang Design University*, 36, 93–103.
- Ward, S. V. (1998). *Selling places: The marketing and promotion of towns and cities, 1850–2000*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Williams, C. C. (1997). *Consumer services and economic development*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, A. M., & Shaw, G. (1988). Tourism: A candyfloss industry or job creator? *Town Planning Review*, 59, 81–103.
- Wilson, G., & McIntosh, A. (2007). Heritage buildings and tourism: An experiential view. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2(2), 75–93.
- World Tourism Organization (2016). *UNWTO annual report 2015*. Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organization.
- Yang, S. Y. (2011). Cultural self-consciousness and the reconstruction of tradition among the Bunun of Taiwan. *Taiwan Journal of Anthropology*, 9(2), 55–93.