

Eva Erdmenger, Trier

Andreas Kagermeier, Trier

Participatory Destination Governance and other Pipe Dreams

A Study of What Host Communities Actually Want – and What They Don't

Partizipative Governance von Destinationen und andere Luftschlösser

**Eine Studie darüber was Gastgebergesellschaften wirklich möchte
– und was nicht**

Abstract: Over the last 50 years, scientific research on destination governance has initiated various models focusing on its participatory aspects, such as collaborative and community-based governance. Implementation of these concepts, however, is still lacking, even though the overtourism discussion has emphasized the importance of residents' consent regarding local tourism development. This paper shifts the perspective from academic concepts to the actual needs and opinions of host communities, in this case Munich, Germany. To collect in-depth data on the perceptions of local residents, and subsequently analyze *if* and *how* they wanted to participate in tourism governance, we used a qualitative, mixed-methods approach including focus groups and photo elicitation. The empirical results show that residents are not very interested in actively engaging in what scholars call “tourism governance” for two reasons: first, they do not see the need for it; second, they do not see any personal benefit. This reinforces the idea that the approach to creating participatory concepts of destination governance must change if communities are to ultimately achieve sustainable tourism development.

Keywords: Participation, Residents, Destination Governance, Munich

Partizipation, Bewohner, Governance von Destinationen, München

1 Introduction

While Catalonians protest against their growing tourist numbers, people in Munich chuckle about visitors sharing their table at the beer garden. The growth in tourist numbers is noticeable in many European urban destinations, yet the reaction of local residents differs remarkably. Why is that?

The growth in tourist numbers in urban destinations contributes to issues such as rising housing prices and increased traffic congestion (ANDERECK et al. 2011, 250; JANUSZ et al. 2017, 127; MILANO 2017, 5). In light of increasing visitor pressure (UNWTO 2018, 28 et seq.) and media coverage about *overtourism*, the role of the host community in tourism governance has been changing (IVARS-BAIDAL et al. 2019, 125). Researchers have started attempts to examine the perspective of communities' citizens on how they experience tourism development in their own hometowns (ANDERECK et al. 2011, 250). On top of that, scholars have been calling for further research on theories that go beyond reactive responses and that focus on proactive, anticipatory strategies. It is for this reason that HARTMAN has stated that "the governance and management issues and discussions that come with (building) resilient tourism destinations still remains under researched in tourism literature" (2018, 2). Paloma ZAPATA, the CEO of Sustainable Destinations International, claimed in an interview that there was "a lack of critical literature around building progressive and effective governance models for cities" (cited in SHEIVACHMAN 2019, n. p.). This is interesting, because when browsing through the last 50 years of tourism governance, it becomes clear that adjectives like "collaborative", "community-based", or other participatory concepts are very popular. However, searching for specific guidelines on how to implement those promising models reveals a huge gap between theoretical concepts and ambitious policies. Scholars, policymakers and planners have designed these concepts based on their knowledge and expertise. They are aware that involvement of people who are affected by tourism is unavoidable.

Nevertheless, research on the perspective of the host communities on participating in tourism governance is lacking. Ironically, including communities' perspectives when developing a bottom-up model is not a common approach, as it seems. Hence, before drafting the nth model of participatory governance *as it should be* – from a researcher's point of view – we should switch perspectives and engage in dialogue with host communities to gain some insights into reality. From a community-oriented perspective, the relevant research questions are: Do residents feel influenced by tourism? If so, positively or negatively? Are they aware of tourism planning and of the ongoing growth in tourist numbers? Are residents aware of the potential conflicts caused by tourism? And foremost, do host communities want to participate in tourism governance, as researchers, policymakers, and planners all presume?

This paper aims to reveal *if* host communities, in this case in Munich, Germany, even want to participate in tourism governance, and if so, under which circumstances. This means calling into question the ongoing development of the concept, and challenging some of the many existing participatory governance models and ideas in line with the theory of disconfirmation through real-world phenomena (see KOCK et al. 2020). To assess the perspective of host communities and to understand their needs and desires, qualitative research is essential. For this reason, this study is based on an innovative, in-depth mixed-methods approach employing focus groups and photo elicitation to reveal the perceptions of affected residents in Munich

(COOPER & HALL 2019; SHARPLY 2018). The intention is to ultimately change the process of how governance models are designed, and how host communities can come to be considered an available resource.

2 Participatory governance and other pipe dreams

Research on the participation of communities in planning and governance processes has existed for more than 50 years. ARNSTEIN's *Ladder of Participation Theory* (1969) is one of the most referenced models. This concept has been further developed and analyzed many times by researchers and policymakers (see HERNTREI 2019; LALICIC & ÖNDER 2018; Hung et al. 2011; DANGI & JAMAL 2016; DREDGE & JAMAL 2015; BOLEY et al. 2014; JAMAL & WATT 2011; HAKLAY et al. 2018; WALKER-LOVE 2016; MOSCARDO 2019). However, the pressure from sustainable development – including in the tourism industry – brought scholars to the conclusion that citizen involvement is essential for a socially sustainable future (UNWTO 2018, ANDERECK et al. 2011; KEOGH 1990; MARTINS 2018; MOSCARDO 2019; LALICIC & ÖNDER 2018). In fact, without the cooperation of residents, destinations suffer from conflicts and a loss in attractiveness, as the media show in weekly *overtourism* discussions.

Traditionally, tourist destinations are managed top-down as a conventional economic sector. The stakeholders who manage and market tourism – destination management/marketing organizations (DMOs) – are either public bodies, meaning they are part of the local government and thus politically influenced, or they are private companies and thus profit-driven. Local communities, meaning the residents of the destination, are usually excluded from (tourism) planning and decision-making processes (HEALY et al. 2012). However, the political emphasis on sustainable development supported by global activist movements (especially in climate change concerns) have disrupted this traditional form of governing. Hence, the term *government* was superseded by *governance* to encompass the change of governments' role in Western economies shaped by neoliberal policies (JAMAL & WATT 2011; HEALY et al. 2012; HALL 2014). The CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN POLICY STUDIES (CEPS, 1995, 5) defined governance as “the whole system of rights, processes and controls established internally and externally over the management of a business entity with the objective of protecting the interest of all stakeholders.” In other words, governance is a complex, holistic, consensus-oriented, and dynamic process, which includes many actors (BERITELLI et al. 2007; ALIPOUR et al. 2011; BRAMWELL & LANE 2011; SCOTT et al. 2015; VEAL, 2011). The first multilayered concepts of collaborative governance were outlined in the 1990s (ANSELL & GASH 2007). Collaborative governance models are characterized by including all three parties – public governmental structures, private entities, and the community at large – in the analysis of mutual needs, the creation of a common vision, and the processes of decision-making (ibid.; PECHLANER et al. 2015, XI). In light of the complexity of this process, researchers have developed several models on how participatory destination governance might or should look like.

KEOGH (1990) was one of the first *tourism* researchers to state that public participation was important for tourism planning. His case-study analysis of Canada in the mid-1980s showed that economic, social and ecological consequences of tourism development influenced the way communities perceived tourism. In other words, the first calls for public participation and more community-oriented approaches date as far back as 1990. However, he postulated that

the “basic aim of any public participation program should be to provide concerned citizens with adequate information,” which only corresponds to one of the eight rungs of ARNSTEIN’s *Ladder of Participation* (1969).

Switching to more recent models, NUNKOO & FUNG SO (2016) analyzed four models that were all based on *Social Exchange Theory*. They concluded that residents who felt power was more equitably distributed had stronger trust in their government, and thus their life satisfaction; this in turn positively influenced the perceived effects of tourism. How this could be achieved was left unexplained, except for the generalization that “tourism benefits are shared across individuals” and that they should be educated and trained to achieve resident empowerment (ibid., 858).

MARTINS (2018) focused on power (im)balances among tourism stakeholders and communities, and argued that communities “should participate actively in all stages of the planning development and implementation, including participation in the resources assessment, in the identification of problems, and in the definition of actions to resolve and prevent problems” (p. 4). Subsequently, he differentiated among three approaches of community participation, sorted according to three levels of power and participation: coercive, induced and spontaneous participation (ibid.). Specific information on how to achieve *spontaneous participation* was not provided.

Focusing on the “smart city” perspective, LALICIC & ÖNDER (2018) suggested including residents in decision-making by using technology, for example in the form of information communication technologies (ICT) or e-governance tools, to achieve “co-participative” tourism planning. According to CARAGLIU et al. (2011, 50) a city is “smart” when “investments in human and social capital and traditional (transport) and modern (ICT) communication infrastructure fuel sustainable economic growth and a high quality of life, with a wise management of natural resources, through participatory governance.” Moreover, these researchers urged destination developers to analyze and understand residents’ attitudes and perceptions of tourism. To collect this data and facilitate collaboration, LALICIC & ÖNDER suggested using social media platforms or geographical information systems as tools. They also categorized other common approaches to boosting social capital, such as trust-building exercises, information campaigns, public meetings, and leadership and roundtable discussions, into three broad approaches: education (information), dialogue (consultation) and co-production of knowledge. These researchers then argued that resident inclusion would need to evolve from one-off occasional activity to substantial co-creation (ibid., 8).

The WORLD TOURISM ORGANIZATION (UNWTO) also included local communities in its 2018 report about overtourism management, yet reduced this mainly to communication methods such as local discussion platforms, content-sharing via social media, and educational communication about behavior. “In this sense, community participation means more than merely asking residents what they want. Active participation means that stakeholders, in this case the local community, have a good overall understanding of the issues and are capable of informed decision making.” By stating this, the UNWTO basically claimed that education would lead to the capability to actively participate. However, specific measures, actions and – foremost – incentives for the successful implementation of this idea were missing.

YUDHA et al. (2019) have developed a “Collaborative Governance Model in Urban Tourism Development” based on the concept of social capital and a pentahelix. They placed communities next to government and business as the acting parties of the tourism development process. Together, these three parties are supposed to produce an outcome of “tourism development sustainability”, but how this process is supposed to work is not further described, except through “stakeholder support... to strengthen the social capital of local communities” (ibid., 42).

MOSCARDO (2019) has used her research to point out that tourism planning has continued to stay stuck in the strategic business planning since the 1980s, even though researchers and policymakers are well aware of how it should be. Causes for this underdevelopment, in her opinion, have been a lack of serious attention paid to community involvement, and that contemporary community development is still too abstract, as outlined above. MOSCARDO clearly stated that involvement was not solely about information exchange and methods like public meetings, surveys, participation in planning groups, and a website with information, but rather about community empowerment and the enhancement of social capital. She listed several possible methods for successful implementation: education about the planning process, decision-making, negotiation, and data collection and analysis. She also brought up education about the local tourism system for community leaders and *local heroes*. She even mentioned theater as a possible educational tool. This approach is highly interesting, since the gamification of governance can increase the motivation of the community to participate. Yet, similar to LALICIC & ÖNDER’S (2018) “smart” approach, this is a very resource and knowledge-intensive method.

3 The case of Munich

The city of Munich is home to 1.5 million people, and experiences residential growth of approximately 0.75% every year (MÜNCHEN 2020). Local tourism development, however, has experienced much higher growth rates. In 2018, 8.3 million arrivals (growth of 6.5% compared to 2017) and 17.1 million overnight stays (growth rate of 9.3%) were registered in Munich. The number of overnight stays has doubled over the last ten years (MÜNCHEN 2019). At the same time, the tourism intensity of Munich is similar to those of the often-discussed “overcrowded” cities of Barcelona, Amsterdam and Berlin (KAGERMEIER & ERDMENGER 2019, 69).

The DMO of Munich – *Tourismus München* – is part of the city administration as a subdivision of the *Referat für Arbeit und Wirtschaft* (RAW, meaning “Department of Labor and Commerce”). In addition to the DMO, there is an organization of partners from the tourism industry called the *Tourismus Initiative München* (TIM) – which is (ideally) supposed to contribute 50% of decision-making processes – and contribute to the tourism budget equally as well. This collaboration between the DMO and the TIM, which is often referred to as the *Munich Model*, thus follows a public-private collaborative governance model.

Prior research (see KAGERMEIER & ERDMENGER 2019) has shown that residents have indeed perceived changes in Munich, they are aware of the city’s expansion, and they have also called for solutions for traffic and housing – even though, generally, those problems are not related to tourism. Subsequently, additional interviews took place in 2019 to research the attitudes of various parties to local tourism development. Considering that tourism affects everyday life and the lifestyle and quality of life of residents in a destination, revealing the

perceptions and responses of the individuals involved requires a comprehensive, qualitative study (SHARPLEY 2018, 301 et seq.; COOPER & HALL 2019, 200). Knowing where and how individuals feel affected by touristification gives insights into how much they are willing to tolerate, revealing potential tipping points regarding tourism growth (insofar as these “tipping points” are a product of perspective) (HALL 2019, 43). On top of that, interviews could reveal what incentives might potentially motivate residents to participate and become active. Therefore, in addition to interviews with representatives of citizens’ initiatives (CI1, CI2) and the DMOs (DMO1, DMO2), it also made sense to find out the residents’ perspective. It is important to point out that CI1 is a traditional alliance of citizens who want to get active on their own terms, whereas CI2 is an initiative of the city government’s Department of Social Services and is thus an official governmental organization called *Allparteiliches Konfliktmanagement in München* (AKIM, loosely translated as “Multipartial Conflict Management in Munich”).



Figure 1: A newly established multi-modal public transit station at Kidlerplatz in Munich, December 2019. Source: Photograph by RES5

The empirical findings on the residents’ side were gathered in three steps:

- 1) Explorative informal interview (RES1-4)
- 2) Photo elicitation (RES5)
- 3) Focus group (RES6-10).

To get first impressions of the residents’ opinions, four residents (RES1-4) were invited for an informal and open discussion about the topic. Those interviews were not recorded and were only documented by the researchers’ records. These initial results, however, were then used to develop a structured, in-depth research design. The research team then tested two methods to compare their applicability and appropriateness for this study and for the following extensive data collection in 2020.

3.1 Photo elicitation

Photographs can be effectively used as stimuli to provoke emotions and facilitate articulation; the literature refers to this as “photo elicitation” (ABASCAL et al. 2018; JANUSZ et al. 2017). Image use in tourism research has mostly been limited to travel motivation, and has generally been underutilized in human geography (ABASCAL et al. 2018; MELIK & ERNSTE 2019; HALL 2009). Since images are becoming more important in communication, some scholars have claimed that pictures not only represent, but even constitute social reality (MELIK & ERNSTE 2019; BOHNSACK 2018). There are different methods of photo elicitation (JANUSZ et al. 2017, 131 et seq.). Either the researcher takes the photographs and therefore controls what will be shown, or the interviewee is responsible for taking pictures herself. A combination of both is also possible.

In this case, our research team tried out a method of photo elicitation that combined the two. First, the interviewee (RES5) was asked to walk with a member of the research team through her own neighborhood, and take photographs of places that either influenced her quality of life or had been affected by tourism development.

Next, we took and prepared 20 photographs ourselves in advance and showed them to the interviewee after the walking and photographing interview to observe if the new stimuli led to new thoughts and stories of the interviewee.

The first part, where the resident chose which route to take and which images to record, did not deliver a great deal of new information. This was caused by two factors: on the one hand, the interviewee was so focused on talking that she stopped paying attention and became disoriented during the walk; in the end, the interviewee preferred to sit on a bench. The interviewee also forgot to take photos. I then had to take the initiative to suggest places to walk and to photograph, and therefore influenced the results. Moreover, the interviewee did not seem to be comfortable with the small outdoor camera that I gave her for the task, which dissuaded the interviewee from taking pictures.

The second part, which took place sitting down instead of walking, and with the interviewee presented with photographs, was more productive. Even though the participant had already talked for more than one hour, the pictures prompted new memories and in some cases put the interviewee's opinion into a different perspective. The interview was voice-recorded and took 1 hour and 45 minutes. Afterwards, the audio file was transcribed and coded in MAXQDA.

3.2 Focus group

Focus groups are a qualitative research method in which a group of five to twelve participants discusses a topic (DANIELS et al. 2018, 184). The method is mostly used in the social sciences to determine people's perceptions about certain topics (ibid., 185). These perceptions depend not only on the core values of the society they belong to, but also on the social group to which they belong (BROWN et al. 2004). For these reasons, a focus group can provide immediate insights into a given sociological phenomenon from different viewpoints at the micro (individual) level and the meso (community) level (DANIELS et al. 2018). Compared to individual interviews, a focus group enhances the knowledge-generating process of externalization (ibid., 186; BEURSKENS & MONTANARI 2018, 152). As MATTISSEK et al. (2013, 183) have stated, this method is not intended to reveal individual opinions, but semi-public positions of individuals as members of a community.

The participants in the focus group had similar demographic characteristics as well as viewpoints. Four men and one woman, middle-aged, employed, living in Munich (in various neighborhoods), and all frequent travelers, participated in the focus group (RES6-10). The participants were contacted via snowball sampling based on RES1-4. Four of the participants had already known at least one other person before the meeting; one participant was



Figure 2: Traffic at Viktualienmarkt, December 2019. Source: Photograph by E. Erdmenger

unacquainted with the others. One person had a professional background in tourism, but the other participants were not directly affected by tourism in their work life.

The group started with a discussion about the tourism vision of Munich's DMO, *Tourismus München*. Afterward, the moderator asked questions about their quality of life, life in Munich generally, and how tourism affects living in Munich. Finally, the same 20 photographs that were used in the individual interviews were passed around and the focus group was instructed to discuss their thoughts and opinions about those pictures.

The focus group meeting took two hours and was recorded for video as well as for audio. It was then transcribed and coded with MAXQDA. All interviews were conducted in German; any following quotes have been translated by the author.

4 Live and let live

Generally, the opinions about residents' involvement differed due to different understandings of "participation". While RES5 explained that social media enabled everyone to host or attend events in the neighborhood (i.e. his/her perception of participation), RES1 hinted at using the district councils as a possibility to participate in discussions about urban issues. Others (RES6; CI1), on the other hand, argued that the lack of inclusion of citizens in planning processes is a problem: "it is generally a dilemma that the citizen is not involved in the planning.... I think it is actually necessary to include the citizens, and the district councils do not help at all" (RES6). At the same time, the interviewees criticized the fact that participation is usually limited to involvement after public announcements have been made concerning concrete decisions and plans (CI1; CI2; RES6). The residents agreed that the city should approach local residents at an earlier stage, proactively invite them, and make the process of contribution more attractive and less complicated (CI1; CI2). CI2 indicated that there was the impression that the inviting authority has not put much effort in those announcement events, and always seemed relieved if not many people showed up – especially people with objections and dissent.

One of the DMOs, representing the perspective of the public authorities, reported on several citizen initiatives against new hotel buildings outside of Munich, describing it as "alarming" and "exhausting", as it might scare potential investors away (DMO2). The residents in the focus group, however, mentioned *self-initiative* as a key factor several times. There are a few examples in Munich where residents took matters into their own hands and were successful, i.e. the development of the creative quarter "Werksviertel" (RES6) or the enhancement of the Sendling neighborhoods by organizing events and activities on an online community website, "nebenan.de" ("Nebenan" means "next door") (RES5). Moreover, residents around Gärtnerplatz, which had become a popular meeting place at night, approached the city with their concerns, and joined forces to find possible solutions for everyone involved (CI2). However, both the interviewees from the citizen initiatives reported that it was always the same few people who were active and engaged (CI1; CI2). One resident (RES7) explained that she would like to share her opinion, but did not have the time and motivation to get involved over a longer period of time. CI1 urged the city to create official "urban planning cells", explaining it as "a suggestion to the local government or the planning department about how 'representative' panels can be created in relation to certain projects. 'Representation'

doesn't have to mean an election, or at least not only one.... Old, young, teenagers, really, a broad range of citizens should be covered.”

Furthermore, most people interviewed used the term “participation” quite often in the context of *culture*. While CII explained that all residents could participate in Munich's culture and that no one would be excluded, the DMO representatives expanded on this thought by stating that all tourists can also participate in the local culture very easily due to its special integrationist value, citing Oktoberfest as an example (DMO1; DMO2). As DMO2 put it:

On the one hand, you wish or want to offer this participation to the guest, meaning in the town squares, including the topic of Oktoberfest and folk festivals. Theoretically, the guest sits next to the people of Munich. That is, for one thing, a unique selling point that is presented externally, but I think that also works the other way around. The inhabitants of Munich say, ‘when it's Oktoberfest, the world is our guest’, and that has been learned and we accept that somehow. Maybe *we* also learned this culture of participation somehow.

Both DMOs also emphasized that they have actively tried to support this possibility to participate when developing new products. Besides Oktoberfest, many interviewees named the local beer gardens as a place of participation, as they elaborated that locals and visitors easily came into contact and struck up conversations (RES5; RES6; RES9; DMO1).

Another key word that came up a lot during interviews was *acceptance*. One of the group interviewees noted that participation works “because you increase acceptance. That's what it's about.... Whether it works well is an open question, but it's about taking them [the locals] along, meeting them, about participation.... Simply that people get the feeling nothing is forced on them” (RES7). Monitoring residents' attitudes to tourism and their acceptance rate is one activity that the DMO of Munich instituted as a consequence of the increasing overtourism issues in other destinations competing with Munich. As the DMO representative noted:

In Munich, we have some other tourist hot spots in addition to just downtown. For that, I'm already fairly calm, but it has to remain limited to those hot spots. Because that's what the residents always clearly emphasize in acceptance monitoring: “Fair enough, but I don't want to have them everywhere. The beer garden in my neighborhood should remain the beer garden in my neighborhood.”

The DMOs reported about their efforts to not only monitor, but also foster the acceptance of locals towards tourists (DMO1; DMO2). According to Munich's current tourism strategy, moderate and sustainable tourism growth is one of the three main goals to ensure that the local population supports tourism development and maintains their welcoming attitude (TOURISMUS MÜNCHEN 2017, 3).

Even though residents want to be included, or at least they are aware that participation is key to socially accepted urban development, not one of the ten residents interviewed could imagine (how) to be involved in *tourism planning* (RES1-10). Several reasons were given. First, these residents did not know and could not imagine what “tourism planning” was or even that organizations and companies (DMOs) existed solely for that purpose (RES10). Second, those residents who were aware of DMOs called them “the experts” and believed that

they themselves could not contribute anything due to a lack of expertise and knowledge about tourism development (RES9). Third, the local citizens did not perceive any problems caused by tourism, and if there were no problems, there was no reason for them to get involved (RES3; RES4; RES5). Drawing on experiences from the work of the multipartial conflict management initiative, CI2 framed it this way:

Why should they bother to be committed? So tourism increases? That is not necessarily in their interest... I don't have to do anything for that... that's already taken care of. Commitment always presupposes interest. Otherwise, they don't fight for anything. Interest or money.

These statements demonstrate that the interviewees did not see any personal benefit or incentive to getting involved in tourism planning.

5 Discussion – what scholars want residents to want, and what they really want

The empirical data shows that residents of Munich are simply not interested in participating in tourism planning activities. They see neither the necessity nor a personal benefit. When the interviewees referred to social media platforms, neighborhood events, and even policymaking meetings, it became clear that they all understood “participation” in very different ways. Therefore, if policymakers, scholars and other authorities talk about “participation”, they should first define what exactly they mean by that. Who should participate how, why, when, where, to what extent, and how often/long?

The example of Gärtnerplatz supports PERKUMIENĖ & PRANSKŪNIENĖ's research results (2019) that showed a proportional relationship between tourism growth and its influence on the life of residents, though in this case tourism growth has to be replaced by *crowding* in general (CI2; IVARS-BAIDAL et al. 2019, 133). As more and more people visited this small square at night, the louder it got, and the more that local residents perceived a decrease in their quality of life. It is crucial to monitor such developments, make both sides aware of the effects, and ensure that both groups of stakeholders –visitors to the square and residents – agree on a solution; this is precisely what the as the multipartial conflict management initiative works to achieve.

The policy guidelines of the UNWTO (2018) suggest various education and communication activities to include the community in overtourism management. The guidelines state that enabling residents to understand the issues is the baseline of community participation. Similarly, NUNKOO & FUNG SO (2016) emphasized that sharing the benefits of tourism with residents as well as educating and training them are key aspects of gaining trust and distributing power. MARTINS (2018) also focused on power imbalances, and called for involving citizens in assessing resources, identifying problems, and defining action. Nevertheless, the question is if local residents *want* to be educated about this. Based on the empirical data from this study, it is necessary to conclude that residents are not interested in being educated or trained in tourism planning whatsoever. On top of that, what is meant by “the issues”? These guidelines remain very vague, and authorities should make sure that citizen participation is not just a “socialwashing” activity.

The main point of the article by YUDHA et al. (2019) was the need for stakeholder support if the host community's social capital is to improve. This connection with social capital offers an interesting, interdisciplinary approach, even if specific actions to improve social capital are missing in their study. In the case of Munich, support from tourism stakeholders possesses great potential, as the *Munich Model* with TIM demonstrates (see Section 3). As the DMOs reported, collaboration between the tourism industry and the public governmental authorities is already strong; it seems realistic to invite community representatives to the same table.

Many of the examples that the interviewees used were related to urban and traffic planning, because *that* is what they perceive in their daily life. Residents do not see the connection or overlap between tourism specifically and urban concerns generally. However, this phenomenon is not limited to citizens' perception. There were many incidents during the study where governmental departments such as urban planning or traffic planning redirected me to the DMO, stating that their job had nothing to do with tourism. It is correct that they are not responsible for it, and perhaps they do not have the expertise to talk about tourism development, but tourism does influence traffic, housing, and many other sectors in a destination. This awareness is lacking in most departments, which is alarming. This overlap of urban and tourism planning is possibly the optimal area for residents to get involved, since this may cover a wider area of interest than any one sector by itself. As an example, the creation of recreational and green spaces, like parks and playgrounds, is a benefit and a meeting place for anyone in the city – host or guest. C11 mentioned one example: “if citizens can use it themselves, like our fountain that we fought for back then.” This is a well-known phenomenon of people only getting involved when they are affected by something. In addition to protecting themselves from negative effects, another motivation for residents would be to benefit from activism, as outlined above. This explains the motivation of the citizen initiatives of the Werksviertel, the community of nebenan.de, and the residents at Gärtnerplatz. In all three cases, although they differed greatly in their form of participation, members of the local community saw a chance to improve their own quality of life – this was the trigger to become involved.

LALICIC & ÖNDER (2018) and IVARS-BAIDAL et al. (2019) analyzed the potential of “smart” cities to employ new technology to deal with the effects of overtourism. Nonetheless, most destination organizations lack the expertise for major ICT systems and e-governance (see SPIL et al. 2017), making this an ambitious approach. The DMO of Munich has only recently started to work with digitalization, i.e. for a “smart” visitor guide system (DMO1). Nevertheless, this means that in this case the potential exists to use technological knowledge and resources for participatory governance methods; this would make Munich a pioneer in innovative destination governance. In light of the quote by LALICIC & ÖNDER (2018, 8) that many researchers agree that residents should not be included in only an “on-off occasional” manner, but rather in a “substantial” way, the residents of Munich in the focus group and the interviews clearly stated that they had neither the capacity nor the interest in becoming hobby policymakers. Thus, the aim of scholars is the exact opposite of residents' actual interest. What has to be considered is that, even if some residents are willing to participate, it has to be attractive and tolerable for them. Most of these people have jobs and secondary activities and interests – only a small minority commits to political activism in the long run as civil society engagement. The reply from RES5 to the question of participation is illuminating:

I don't know, I don't want to. However, if I lived in a neighborhood that was affected, well, then I would indeed be thankful if I were included. As far as that goes, maybe my thinking is a bit short-term. Maybe, yes I do.

Even though more people have become more active, mostly due to climate change, activism is often only short lived, or remains within private activities instead of public activism. Indeed, only a few people are currently active in the local citizens' initiative (CI1). Besides asking how more people can be motivated, authorities should make a virtue out of necessity, and empower those few dedicated people to become what some authors have called "*local heroes*" (DMO2). Why not support those people and make them ambassadors of the community? After all, they are probably far more effective at making themselves heard among their neighbors than politicians and councils. That is one aspect of MOSCARDO's approach (2019). She put forth two rather creative methods that can be seen in Munich's governance approach. First, she referred to "local heroes" such as community leaders; this is also the exact term mentioned in Munich's strategy, but unfortunately the purpose and tasks of these individuals has remained undefined. Second, Munich has used "playful" activities to motivate people to deal with the topic of tourism; in this case, the city supported improvisational theater related to the topic at a local art and culture festival.

During the interviews, some positive examples emerged. The first of these was the multipartial conflict management initiative, which mediates between residents and the late-night revelers (who are actually rarely tourists) in residents' neighborhoods (CI2). The representative from the initiative explained that they were not solution-finders, but that they focused on inviting people to change their perspectives and therefore facilitate greater understanding and tolerance with each other (CI2). On top of that, they indicated that residents appreciate having a contact person who visits them, who takes their concerns seriously and looks into the issue to understand the circumstances (CI2). This leads to empowerment, a higher tolerance level, and ultimately a more resilient community. As CI2 stated, "If we know that what I think matters, then I can dare to think about what I really want." The initiative has experienced increasingly better collaboration with other authorities since they started to realize that they could benefit from each other's work (CI2). As mentioned above, the independent conflict management initiative does not focus on tourism issues – indeed, it has only been in contact with the local DMO once, to approach them with a request to stop promoting Gärtnerplatz as a hip meeting place in Munich at night (CI2). Yet this again proves that cross-sectoral collaboration and communication is highly beneficial and efficient for everyone involved. It would be even more beneficial if the DMO initiated a project with the multipartial conflict management group to reinforce the findings of their quantitative monitoring with qualitative data retrieved from the dialogues between the initiative and the residents that come to them for assistance.

Another positive example that emerged concerned a pilot project that DMO1 hosted at an outdoor art and culture festival in Munich in 2019. The communication activity project, called "tourism in dialogue", invited residents (who were the main target group of the festival generally) to talk with employees of the DMO about tourism in the city (DMO1). In addition to using benches to serve as a more inviting location for a dialogue, the DMO also used creative methods such as an integrationist improvisational theater group to communicate with passers-by (GRAF 2019). It made sense to conduct relaxed conversations instead of

standardized surveys, considering the purpose of the event. On the other hand, there was no structure, alignment, or documentation of this qualitative data collection whatsoever (ibid.). This makes subsequent analysis – or even general use – of this information almost impossible. However, future dialogues of this type could take place at those events organized by the nebenan.de community or even in beer gardens, as they are often perceived as a shared host-guest space (KAGERMEIER & ERDMENGER 2019). It would still be a challenge to approach and include uncommitted and transient communities, because providing even low-threshold information and interaction needs effort and patience. In sum, the creativity and the ideas of how to connect and communicate which the DMO displayed were highly interesting and promising, but still left room for improvement for subsequent activities. Nonetheless, the DMO's high awareness of the need to complement tourism development with the wishes of Munich's residents is praiseworthy: "I think that tolerance is grounded in participation. If everyone has the feeling they will mutually benefit, then, I think, rejection is not that strong. It is in that connection that the key to commitment actually lies" (DMO1). This explanation aligns with a local saying that various interviewees mentioned in the context of their attitudes toward tourist crowds: "Live and let live" (RES5, RES8).

To sum it up, the participatory governance models and guidelines outlined in this paper are not only vague, but also do not match residents' needs and interests. Participatory governance has to reach the next level. We need to rethink the approach of continuous resident involvement in tourism governance. Instead, in times of DMOs restructuring from destination marketing to management organizations, the redistribution of tasks has to be reviewed on a bigger scale. Therefore, we suggest that DMOs consider assigning certain tourism governance tasks to public authorities insofar as these authorities should be more people-focused. This would also foster collaboration between urban and tourism planning, in contrast to economy-driven and marketing-skilled DMOs. Instead of transforming marketing to management, local governments should establish public "destination host organizations" (DHO). The focus of such organizations should be interaction with the local population and the design of a new governance model based on what they really want and are willing to participate in.

They choose what works for them. So choice is everything and power decides choice. And we need those in power – politicians, leaders, governments ... planners, researchers – and all of us in our everyday life need to respect choices. Instead of choosing what is right for people, ... let's acknowledge and empower their choices. And that is how we can build better and inclusive cities for tomorrow, completing the imagery of cities built by the choices of its own people. (JOHARI 2019, n. p.)

6 Conclusion

To achieve sustainable and responsible tourism development in cities, the participation of citizens is essential (KABISCH et al. 2018, 6; SPIL et al. 2017, 122). At least, that is what scholars and policymakers have aimed for. This study dared to question this, taking a qualitative approach to change perspective, and ask locals if they actually *wanted* to participate in tourism governance. This was rejected by 100% of the respondents. Only as a second thought did one interviewee add that this could change if problems caused by tourism appeared in her own neighborhood, such as commercialized Airbnb apartments in her apartment building (RES5). Such opinions are rationalized by the fact that the residents did not perceive any negative effect on their quality of life stemming from tourism, and so there

was no incentive or motivation for them to become active and participate in any task related to destination governance. Most participatory, community-based and collaborative destination governance models that experts have designed over the decades seem to be pipe dreams.

The case study of Munich provided a few initial ideas about what such a participatory governance model would look like from the perspective of the people who supposedly would participate. Instead of drafting abstract concepts of “empowerment” and “trust building”, policymakers should start by finding incentives to motivate locals to participate. These crucial points are not at the core of the tourism industry, but instead lie in areas that overlap with other sectors such as housing and traffic, making early stakeholder collaboration an important factor. If motivational factors are found, citizens should be approached in an attractive and welcoming low-threshold way, even if this costs patience as well as financial resources. Only if the city or the DMO seriously wants locals to participate will they be successful. Half-hearted actions do not appeal to the target group, as MOSCARDO described in her findings (2019).

Once contact with interested residents – as diverse as possible – exists, everyone needs to mutually agree on the general conditions of participation. This means that public authorities (local government) and private stakeholders (the DMO) must first allocate resources to make resident participation realistic, followed by the residents’ stepping up to speak for themselves and define participation.

This study has left some questions open, which will require further research. Since this paper is based on a single specific case, the same approach should be applied to other destinations. In light of BARCACCIA et al.’s (2013, 187) conclusion that culture is a “macro-component” of quality of life, further cross-cultural comparisons are needed to analyze this coherence. Another open question is the role of place attachment and the identity of the local community (see GUO et al. 2018), which appeared to be a crucial factor in Munich and will therefore be the subject of follow-up research. The same is true for the closely related concept of ethnocentrism in a destination (see KOCK et al. 2019).

There is a reason why scholars have designed plenty of participatory governance models over the past 50 years. Nonetheless, implementation is still very rare due to the abstract nature and the effort-intensity of all of these concepts. Participatory destination governance is without a doubt necessary for socially acceptable tourism development. We just have to rethink the approach, and actually ask the right people – the residents of the tourist destinations.

Literature

- ABASCAL, T. E., M. FLUKER & M. JIANG 2018: Image Use in Tourism Research Methodology. In: HILLMAN, W. & K. RADEL [Eds.]: *Qualitative Methods in Tourism Research. Theory and Practice*. Bristol. Channel View. pp. 248–278.
- ANDERECK, K. L. & G. P. NYAUPANE 2011: Exploring the Nature of Tourism and Quality of Life Perceptions among Residents. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 50, 3, pp. 248–260.
- ANSELL, C. & A. GASH 2007: Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. In: *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18, 4, pp. 543–571.
- ARNSTEIN, S. R. 1969: A Ladder of Citizen Participation. In: *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35, 4, pp. 216–224.
- BARCACCIA, E.M., BERTOLASO & E. DE MARINIS 2013: Defining Quality of Life: A wild-Goode Chase? In: *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 9, 1, pp. 185–203.
- BERITELLI, P., T. BIEGER & C. LAESSER, 2007: Destination Governance: using Corporative Governance Theories as a Foundation for Effective Destination Management. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, pp. 96–107.
- BEURSKENS K. & G. MONTANARI 2018: Von der Auswertung zum Gegenstand. Wenn die Methode ein Eigenleben entwickelt. In: MEYER, F., J. MIGGELBRINK & K. BEURSKENS [Eds.]: *Ins Feld und zurück – Praktische Probleme qualitativer Forschung in der Sozialgeographie*. Springer, pp. 149–156.
- BOHNSACK, R. 2018: Bildinterpretation. In: BOHNSACK, R., A. GEIMER & M. MEUSER [Eds.] *Hauptbegriffe Qualitativer Sozialforschung*. 4. vollst. überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Verlag Barbara Budrich. Opladen & Toronto, pp. 18–23.
- BOLEY, B. B., N. G. MCGEHEE, R. R. PERDUE & P. LONG 2014: Empowerment and resident attitudes toward tourism: Strengthening the theoretical foundation through a Weberian lens. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, pp. 33–50.
- BRAMWELL, B. & B. LANE 2011: Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. In: *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19, 4/5, pp. 411–421.
- BROWN, J., A. BOWLING & T. FLYNN 2004: Models of Quality of Life: A Taxonomy, Overview and Systematic Review of the Literature. *European Forum on Population Aging Research*.
- CARAGLIU, A., C. DEL BO & P. NIJKAMP 2011: Smart Cities in Europe. In: *Journal of Urban Technology*, 18, 2, pp. 65–82.
- CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN POLICY STUDIES (CEPS) (1995): *Corporate Governance*. Working paper report No. 12. Brussels.

- COOPER C. & C. M. HALL 2019: *Contemporary Tourism. An International Approach*. Fourth Edition. Goodfellow Publishers Limited, Oxford.
- DANGI, T. & T. JAMAL 2016: An Integrated Approach to “Sustainable Community-Based Tourism”. In: *Sustainability*, 8, 5.
- DANIELS C., W. HILLMANN & K. RADEL 2018: Qualitative Tourism Research: Focus Groups. - In: HILLMANN W. & K. RADEL [Eds.]: *Qualitative Methods in Tourism Research: Theory and Practice*. Channel View, Bristol, pp. 184–199.
- DEUTSCHER TOURISMUSVERBAND (DTV) 2019: *Zahlen – Daten – Fakten*. Berlin 2019.
- DREDGE, D. & T. JAMAL 2015: Progress in tourism planning and policy: A post-structural perspective on knowledge production. In: *Tourism Management*, 51, pp. 285–297.
- ERDMENGER, E. 2019: Community Resilience in Urban Tourist Destinations. How Beer Garden Romance and a Hygge Localhood Boost Social Capital. In: *Zeitschrift für Tourismuswissenschaft*, 11, 3, pp. 437–450.
- GRAF, K. 2019: *Kommunikationsmaßnahme von München Tourismus zur Bürgerbefragung beim Kunstareal-Fest 2019*. [Unpublished Report].
- GUO, Y., J. ZHANG, Y. ZHANG & C. ZHENG 2018: Catalyst or Barrier? The Influence of Place Attachment on Perceived Community Resilience in Tourism Destinations. In: *Sustainability*, 10, 7, n. p.
- HAKLAY, M., P. JANKOWSKI & Z. ZWOLIŃSKI, 2018: Selected Modern Methods and Tools for Public Participation in Urban Planning – A Review. In: *Quaestiones Geographicae* 37, 3, pp. 127–149.
- HALL, C. M. 2014: Introduction. *Tourism Policies, Planning and Governance*. In: LEW, A. A., C. M. HALL & A. M. WILLIAMS (Ed.): *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Tourism*, First Edition, John Wiley & Sons, pp. 537–541.
- HALL C. M. 2019: Resilience theory and tourism. In: SAARINEN J. & A. GILL [Eds.]: *Resilient Destinations and Tourism. Governance Strategies in the transition towards sustainability in tourism*. Routledge. London and New York. pp. 34–47.
- HALL C. M., G. PRAYAG & A. AMORE 2018: *Tourism and Resilience. Individual, Organisational and Destination Perspectives*. *Tourism Essential* (5). Channel View Publications Limited, Bristol.
- HARTMAN, S. 2018: Resilient Tourism Destinations? Governance implications of bringing theories of resilience and adaptive capacity to tourism practice. In: Innerhofer E., M. Fontanari & H. Pechlaner (Eds.) *Destination Resilience – Challenges and Opportunities for Destination Management and Governance*. pp. 66–75.

- HEALY, N., H. RAU & J. McDONAGH 2012: Collaborative Tourism Planning in Ireland: Tokenistic Consultation and the Politics of Participation. In: *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 14, 4, pp. 450–471.
- HERNTREI, M. 2019: Tourist go home! Beobachtungen zu Overtourism und einer sinkenden Tourismusakzeptanz in Europa. Welche Folgen ergeben sich für Wissenschaft und Praxis? In: Pechlaner, H. (Ed.): *Destination und Lebensraum. Perspektiven touristischer Entwicklung. Entrepreneurial Management und Standortentwicklung Perspektiven für Unternehmen und Destinationen*. Wiesbaden. Springer Gabler. pp. 107–123.
- HOBEN, A. 2018: München ist bei Touristen beliebter denn je. In: *Süddeutsche.de*, 22 August 2018. Available at www.sueddeutsche.de/muenchen/2.220/reiseziel-muenchen-ist-bei-touristen-beliebterdenn-je-1.4101001
- HUNG, K., E. SIRAKAYA-TURK & L. J. INGRAM 2011: Testing the Efficacy of an Integrative Model for Community Participation. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 50, 3, pp. 276–288.
- IVARS-BAIDAL, J. A.; HERNÁNDEZ, M. G.; MIGUEL, S. M. DE 2019: Integrating Overtourism in the Smart Tourism Cities Agenda. In: *e-Review of Tourism Research*, 17, 2, pp. 122–139.
- JAMAL, T. & E. M. WATT 2011: Climate change pedagogy and performative action: toward community-based destination governance. In: *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19, 4/5, pp. 571–588.
- JANUSZ, K., S. SIX & D. VANNESTE 2017: Building tourism-resilient communities by incorporating residents' perceptions? A photo-elicitation study of tourism development in Bruges. In: *JTF*, 3, 2, pp. 127–143.
- JOHARI, S. J. 2019: What if the poor were part of city planning? Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/smriti_jukur_johari_what_if_the_poor_were_part_of_city_planning
- KABISCH, S., F. KOCH & D. RINK 2018: Urbane Transformationen unter dem Leitbild der Nachhaltigkeit. In: *Geographische Rundschau*, 6, pp. 4–9.
- KAGERMEIER, A. & E. ERDMENGER 2019: Overtourismus: Ein Beitrag für eine sozialwissenschaftlich basierte Fundierung und Differenzierung der Diskussion. In: *Zeitschrift für Tourismuswissenschaft*, 11, 1, pp. 65–98.
- KEOGH, B. 1990: Public Participation in Community Tourism Planning. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, pp. 449–465.
- KOCK, F., A. JOSIASSEN, A. G. ASSAF, I. KARPEN & F. FARRELLY 2019: Tourism Ethnocentrism and Its Effects on Tourist and Resident Behavior. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 58, 3, pp. 427–439.
- KOCK, F., A. G. ASSAF & M. G. TSIONAS 2020: Developing Courageous Research Ideas. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 2020, pp. 1–7.

- LALICIC, L., & I. ÖNDER 2018: Residents' Involvement in Urban Tourism Planning: Opportunities from a Smart City Perspective. In: *Sustainability*, 10, 6, 1852.
- MARTINS, M. 2018: Tourism planning and tourismphobia. An analysis of the strategic tourism plan of Barcelona 2010-2015. In: Munich Personal RePEc Archive. Available at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/88203/>.
- MATTISSEK, A., C. PFAFFENBACH & P. REUBER 2013: *Methoden der empirischen Humangeographie*. Westermann. Braunschweig.
- MOSCARDO, G. 2019: Rethinking the role and practice of destination community involvement in tourism planning. In: ANDRIOTIS, K, D. STYLIDIS & A. WEIDENFELD, (Eds.) *Tourism policy and planning implementation. Contemporary geographies of leisure, tourism and mobility*. Routledge, London. pp. 36–52.
- MÜNCHEN 2019: *Tourismus. Wachstum besonders aus dem Inland*. Available at <https://www.muenchen.de/rathaus/wirtschaft/branchen/tourismus.html>
- MÜNCHEN 2020: *Bevölkerung. Daten zur Demographie*. Available at <https://www.muenchen.de/rathaus/Stadtfinfos/Statistik/Bev-lkerung.html>
- NUNKOO, R. & K. K. FUNG SO 2016: Residents' Support for Tourism: Testing Alternative Structural Models. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 55, 7, pp. 847–861.
- PECHLANER, H., P. BERITELLI, S. PICHLER, M. PETERS & N. SCOTT (Eds.) 2015: *Contemporary Destination Governance: A Case Study Approach*. 1st edition. Bingley, UK: Emerald (Bridging Tourism Theory and Practice, 6).
- PERKUMIENĖ, D. & R. PRANSKŪNIENĖ 2019: Overtourism: Between the Right to Travel and Residents' Rights. In: *Sustainability*, 11, 7, 2138.
- SCOTT, N., E. LAWS, J. AGRUSA & H. RICHINS 2015: Tourist Destination Governance: Some Approaches and Suggestions for Future Research. In: LAWS, E., H. RICHINS & J. AGRUSA (Eds.): *Tourist Destination Governance: Practice, Theory and Issues*. Wallingford, Oxon, CABI Publishing, pp. 203–212.
- SHARPLEY, R. 2018: *Tourism, Tourist and Society*. Fifth Edition. Routledge, Oxon & New York.
- SHEIVACHMAN, A. (2019): How Bad Will It Get When Overtourism Meets Climate Change? Available at <https://skift.com/2019/07/30/how-bad-will-it-get-when-overtourism-meets-climate-change/>
- SPIL, T., R. EFFING & J. KWAST 2017: Smart City Participation: Dream or Reality? A Comparison of Participatory Strategies from Hamburg, Berlin & Enschede. In: SIMINTIRAS A., S. AL-SHARHAN, A. K. KAR, P. V. ILAVARASAN, M. P. GUPTA, M. MANTYMAKI, Y. K. DWIVEDI & M. JANSSEN [Eds.]: *Digital Nations – Smart Cities, Innovation, and Sustainability*. Springer, pp. 122-134.

TOURISMUS MÜNCHEN 2017: Einfach Erfolgreiche. Tourismusstrategie für München. Available at <https://www.muenchen.travel/artikel/ueber-uns/tourismusstrategie>

VEAL, A. J. 2011: Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide. Fourth edition. Pearson Education Limited. Harlow.

WALKER-LOVE, A. 2016: Report on Innovative Citizen Engagement Strategies, GA No. 646511. In: Regeneration Model for accelerating smart URBAN.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION 1996: WHOQOL-BREF. Introduction, Administration, Scoring and Generic Version of the Assessment. Dr. John Orley (Ed.), World Health Organization. Programme on Mental Health. Geneva.

WORLD TOURISM ORGANISATION (UNWTO) 2018: ‘Overtourism’? Understanding and Managing Urban Tourism Growth beyond Perceptions. Available at <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/book/10.18111/9789284420070>

YUDHA, P., O. R. DAMAR & FANANI. A. A. 2019: Urban Tourism Based on Social Capital Development Model. In: Eurasia: Economics & Business, 1, 19. pp. 37–42.

Eva Erdmenger, M. A., Freizeit- und Tourismusgeographie, Universität Trier, Universitätsring 15, 54296 Trier, Germany, email: erdmenger@uni-trier.de

Professor Dr. Andreas Kagermeier, Freizeit- und Tourismusgeographie, Universität Trier, Universitätsring 15, 54296 Trier, Germany, email: andreas@kagermeier.de