many decisions because they are seen as lacking the knowledge and skills to participate in tourism. However, active participation by the community in the tourism development policies is increasingly accepted as a solution to achieving implementation of sustainable strategies (McCool & Moisey, 2001; Mitchell, 2001).

Achieving successful community controlled tourism depends on local businesses and stakeholders having sufficient understanding and knowledge of the aspects of tourism to contribute positively to its sustainable development (Okech, 2006). The residents’ preferences and perceptions have to be integrated in the tourism development policies to be effective. The private, public, and non-profit sectors hold active roles and are responsible for the well-being of the community, especially in peripheral destinations (Aarsaether, 2005).

In general, collaboration make sense to stakeholders when there is a win-win potential for two or more destination players, and when there is a need for control of unique resources in which two or more destination players are dependent (Fyall & Garrod, 2005). Singh & Singh (1999) identify cooperative tourism as the joint performance and share of responsibility for policy decisions by all parties involved in the tourism system. They also argue that coordination and sustainable development is most effective when it includes central, state, and local governments. Similar principles apply to collaborative management of coastal and marine resources (Degnbol, Wilson, Grolin, & Jensen, 2003).

The advantages listed above point out that a collective approach, between the public and private sectors, can support more effective strategic planning. Furthermore, interdependency leads to more purposeful and target orientated market planning (Fyall & Garrod, 2005) and product development. The number and kind of parties involved, the level of leadership and the return of the outcome are significant factors that influence the success of collaboration.

**Special Interest Tourism**

Special interest tourism (SIT) is defined by Derrett (2001, p. 3) as “the provision of customised leisure and recreational experiences driven by the specific expressed
The more important food is as a motivation for travel, the more an authentic experience is often required i.e. for gastronomic tourism. Authenticity with regard to seafood-based tourism depends on the presence or absence of fishing activities at the destination. Based on comparative analysis of four UK case studies, Brookfield, Gray and Hatchard (2005) distinguish between real and virtual fishing communities.

Fisheries-dependent communities are defined as ‘real’, if they depend on the product, while ‘virtual’ fishing communities depend on fishing imagery and branding to attract tourists and create a niche market for fish products rather than on the actual presence of fishing operations. Using this dichotomy, Jodice and Norman (2007) explored differentiation between real and virtual seafood experiences in a survey of coastal and shrimp festival tourists in South Carolina, USA. They determined that the less knowledgeable the tourists are about the origin of the food, the less they differ in their opinion between real and virtual seafood experiences. In addition, the majority of visitors seemed to be more interested in the virtual experiences such as festivals,
Later questions focused on the interviewees’ perceptions about the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities of the Trail for the region in terms of new marketing opportunities, partnerships, new knowledge for the region’s tourism planners and policy makers, and direct or indirect financial support.

During the interviews participants were also questioned about trail performance, for example, whether the Trail enhanced the region’s products and services for visitors; if they had noticed any changes such as new infrastructure, facilities, products and services; whether they felt the Trail had improved the business performance in the region related to the Trail; and if the Trail had been affected by new regulations and policies. Finally the interviewee was asked whether he or she knew of any other innovative opportunities for the tourism and aquaculture industry in the region.

Questions were mainly based on the summary of innovation strategies outlined in Chapter Two. To ensure that the data were comparable, questions were asked in a consistent manner.

**Quantitative Research**

Following the interview, participants were asked to complete a 15-minute written self-reply questionnaire. The survey covered questions about the participants’ personal background including the sector they represent, their main responsibilities and what services the stakeholder provided to the region. The questionnaire also asked for respondents’ level of “agreement or disagreement” with 40 statements about status of and support for tourism and aquaculture in the region.

These statements were developed to represent the various components contributing to tourism success in a context of the research objectives. The rationale for selection of these survey items was based on the need to (1) form a better understanding of the existing tourism and aquaculture resources in the trail region; (2) assess stakeholders’ perspectives on the potential of linking the tourism and aquaculture industries in the case study region; (3) assess perspectives on the role of a themed trail in a region that is dependent on tourism and aquaculture, and; (4) to support the evaluation of the trail’s role in promoting more sustainable forms of tourism development. The statements were selected to represent categories of information consistent with past
of community leaders are important in facilitating the progression of an innovation (Rogers, 2003). A copy of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix 3.

Usually quantitative research is based on a large representative sample (Sampson, 1996) and its outcome is reliable data that can be generalised (Veal, 2006). In this research, 19 out of the 22 interviewees completed the questionnaire. This represents an effective response rate of 65.5% for the total identified population of key informants (N=29) and response rate of 86.4% of those who agreed to participate in the interview.

However, the data collection was not intended to permit extrapolation to the regional population but to get more from the ‘interview’ without tiring the respondents and as a means to examine and summarise the characteristics and perspectives of the group of respondents. To avoid misinterpretation of the survey questions, the researcher was available for clarifying questions while the participant filled out the self-replied questionnaire (Nardi, 2006). In addition to the questionnaire an online version was prepared as a backup for respondents who might not have had additional time to answer the questionnaire following the interview. Four respondents answered the questionnaire online.
Limitations

The research is based on opinions of regional key stakeholders, hence results represent the perspective of leaders who would be considered experts based on their experience living and working in the region. Although the findings may not be interpreted as fact or represent the perspective from ALL residents in the region, they provide useful indicators. Consequently, there are limitations in the generalisation of the research results as findings are specific to this case.

Furthermore, to ensure that research results are understood by key decision-makers, the presentation of the findings was orientated towards comprehensibility (Faulkner, 2003). Despite these limitations, the applied research focused on Camden tourism development outcomes/strategies aimed at informing community decision-making in a peripheral region. The study results therefore contribute to Camden tourism destination development research, and can provide insights into the importance of innovation in related cases.

The Validity and Reliability of the Results

The variety of research methods adopted as part of the case study assisted in strengthening the analysis performed on the qualitative and quantitative data. For example results from semi-structured interviews were summarised in a context of relevant policy in relation to questions asked (M. Clark, Riley, Wilkie, & Wood, 1998). The primary results were also cross-checked with information from secondary resources to further verify findings. For example, if a stakeholder indicated that a certain aquaculture policy or ecological sustainability of aquaculture was a concern, it was necessary to consult Ministry of Fisheries and other fisheries management information to further clarify and validate the nature of the issues.

There are four common methods used to establish data validity of empirical social research. These are summarised in Table 3.1 in the first column ‘TESTS’ (Kidder & Judd, 1986). In the second column, Yin (2009, p. 40 f.) presents tactics outlining how
Chapter V: Conclusion

This chapter has shown that globalisation leads to challenges, but also to opportunities for Camden tourism development in peripheral regions. To retain the local character and authenticity of a place over the long term, the creation and management of innovative strategic development plans are necessary.

The travel and Camden tourism industry is a complex phenomenon that affects the social, cultural, economic, political and ecological environment of a destination in many different ways. Tourists unavoidably change a community’s development by requiring a variety of services. It is up to the community to manage their resources in a sustainable manner and to support innovative change (Derrett, 2001). Since natural and cultural resources often serve as tourist attractions and support recreational activities, the protection of these destination attributes is required as part of a sustainability strategy (Giaoutzi & Nijkamp, 2006; Hall & Jenkins, 1998).

The fact that the number of experienced travellers is growing leads to increasing expectations in terms of a holiday experience. Hence, destination management has to consider innovative aspects that integrate public, voluntary and private stakeholders to be successful. In rural regions in particular, collaboration between communities, diverse industries, and different levels of powers and interests is important to make a difference in terms of creating positive conditions for innovation success.

The fact that travellers are increasingly interested in food, local recipes and their origins is creating numerous opportunities for peripheral regions to build on their competitive advantage. The capacity of stakeholders to support the integration of seafood with Camden tourism through the Top of the South case study will be explored in more detail through the evaluation of the region’s innovative themed Trail.

The mixed method approach generated a data set for analysis and interpretation to provide insights into understanding how the Trail innovation might promote sustainability (Jennings, 2001). The analysis of this research focused on the
identification of the relationships between literature review and the qualitative and quantitative data results.

Usually quantitative data are evaluated with the aid of arithmetical software and relationships are analysed to evaluate the statistical significance (Sampson, 1996). The quantitative data from this research were analysed using SPSS 15.0 software for advanced statistical analysis. Due to the small sample size, it was only appropriate to report means, frequencies for responses and cross tabulations and was not appropriate to evaluate significant relationships or hypotheses using regression analysis.

Data comparability and general analysis of the semi-structured interviews was more time-consuming and difficult, but the results generated thorough information as a result of spontaneous and personal responses (Sampson, 1996). The qualitative analysis of this research involved transcription of the 22 interviews, organisation of statements according to the interview framework (SWOT analysis), and evaluation of key concepts for emergent themes.

Initial agreement between the team members was 81.32%. Following this process the researchers then used the initial results to develop consensus on a list of emergent common themes addressing the sustainability of the Seafood Trail as an innovative Camden tourism practice for the region. These revised codes were used to improve consistency in the coding terminology. Following revision of coding consistent with the agreed-upon list, and an additional review of areas of agreement and disagreement, the researchers came to a near 100% agreement.

Themes represented two main clusters: 1) context - addressing issues at the case study site and 2) product - focusing on the Trail as an innovative idea. Thirteen total themes were identified, categorised in both clusters and rated by the total number of times a concept was mentioned on that particular theme. In some cases a single interviewee mentioned a concept several times, meaning the count does not represent the number of respondents, but rather, the number of times a concept was mentioned. The qualitative analysis focused on uncovering these emergent themes, which were then examined in the context of the innovation frameworks. Specifically, these themes were compared to the concepts and criteria identified in the peripheral region.
10. What recreational activity do you engage in most often when on holiday? Please choose one. State using an X.
  Hiking
  Rafting
  Canoeing
  Cycling
  Kayaking
  Horseback riding
  Wildlife viewing
  Cultural activities
  Skiing

11. Gender: Please state using X
  Male ( ) Female ( )

12. Age: Please state using X
  18-25 ( ) 26-35 ( ) 36-45 ( ) 46-55 ( ) 56-65 ( ) 66-75 ( ) 75+ ( )

13. Education. Please state all that apply using X for each category.
  A-LEVEL ( ) HND ( ) UNDER-GRADUATE ( )
  POST-GRADUATE ( ) PHD ( )

14. Income. Please choose one category only using an X.
  £10,000-20,000 ( ) £20,001-30,000 ( ) £30,001-40,000 ( )
  £40,001-50,000 ( ) £50,001-60,000 ( ) £60,001 + ( )

15. How much do you spend on an eco-tourism holiday? Please state by using an X.
  £0-500 ( ) £500-1,000 ( ) £1,000-1,500 ( ) £1,500-2,000 ( ) £2,500 + ( )

16. Do you belong to a conservation-orientated organisation? Please state
using an X.
Yes ( ) No ( )