

Challenges for the Positioning of Destinations: Destination Formation Processes and Territorial Boundaries

Part I (Framke) Conventional business oriented understanding

Part II (Framke) Sociological understanding

Geographical limitation of the destination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agreement about destination as an important place – No agreement about spatial characteristics: 'destinations' are units without specific geographical boundaries at several geographical and/or administrative levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Destination as a place without defined geographical boundaries, developed by continuous processes of social interaction among actors participating in the process – 'Destinations' as structures, as images, and as results of social practice
Destination content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agglomeration of core and peripheral attractions and services – Dynamic with respect to the tourists demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – With regard to the dynamic process shaping the place where tourism happens – No clear description of content – Attractions , culture, events, landscapes and services are mentioned
Cooperation at a destination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implicit understanding of the need for cooperation in the tourism industry – No discussion of character and significance of cooperation for the constitution of a destination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No description of cooperation at a destination – Talk about connections and social practice without further specification
The tourist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seen as economic consumers, as segments, as types – Changing demand changes the structure and content of the 'destination' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seen as experience-seeking social actor and as consumer – The tourist demand creates social practices forming a tourism space

Slide 2

Part III (Wöhler) De-destinationalization

Part IV (Wöhler) New destinationlism

Geographical limitation of the destination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agreement about a cross border destination as an amalgamated space – Agreement about spatial characteristics: several small/single destinations form a spatial destination unit as a competition object; boundaries are constructed by institutions (local administration, DMO, consulting firms) – Model: relational destinationality (spatiality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agreement about a destination as a space of capabilities and identification – Overall agreement about the spatial characteristics: destination is a space of living, cultural practices, shared meanings and face-to-face relationships – Model: destination as a container (genius loci, essential place)
Destination content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bargained agglomeration of some or only one core and staged attractions – Imagining amalgamated destination unit in terms of its external positioning and its internal counterpart (SWOT-analysis) – Adapting to market and competition produce permanent changes, new investments and a progressive de-territorialization – Destination products are for "them" but not for us and last but not least – a homogenization of products (and destinations) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Attractions based on destination capabilities as an integration of explicit and tacit knowledge, routines and competencies (social and cultural embedded products, resources) – Imagining destination as possible position in a market – Questions such as "Who are we?", " What do we do?" and "What don't we do?" determine destination strategy and product arrangements; thus: products for us and not for SWOT-constructed target groups – Destination products as results of arguing: combining creatively several different "earthed" resources; therefore: destinations are Slide 3 – Authentic products

Part III (Wöhler) De-destinationalization

Part IV (Wöhler) New destinationlism

Cooperation at a destination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bargaining between the single destinations at the local level – DMO of the united destinations as a dominant focal actor in the inter-destination network: hierarchical product-coordination (hierarchical network governing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Explicit cooperation between actors of the whole destination society – Destination actors are reflexive arguing subjects; by constructing product-combinations they constitute heterarchic networks
The tourist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seen as experience and event seeking social actor and as a disloyal consumer – The tourist demand creates social practices forming cross border destinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seen as experience-seeking social actor and as sustainable consumer – The tourist confirms the "earthed" products and makes such a destination competitive

Slide 4

Literatur:

Framke, Wolfgang (2002), The Destination as a Concept: A Discussion of the Business-related Perspective versus the Socio-cultural Approach in Tourism Theory, in: Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 2 (2), S. 92-108.

Saretzki, Anja/Wöhler, Karlheinz (2012), Governance statt Management oder: Management der Governance, in: dies. (Hrsg.), Destination Governance – Neue Ansätze der Steuerung von Destinationen, Berlin (forthcoming).

Weick, Karl E. (1998), Der Prozess des Organisierens, 2. Aufl., Frankfurt am Main.

Wöhler, Karlheinz (2011), Touristifizierung von Räumen, Wiesbaden.

Slide 5

**Thank you very much for
your attention!**

Slide 6