



Heriot-Watt University  
Research Gateway

## Engaging and marketing to stakeholders in World Heritage Site management

### Citation for published version:

Lochrie, S 2016, 'Engaging and marketing to stakeholders in World Heritage Site management: a United Kingdom multiple case study perspective', *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 32, no. 15-16, pp. 1392-1418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2016.1186107>

### Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/0267257X.2016.1186107](https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2016.1186107)

### Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

### Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

### Published In:

Journal of Marketing Management

### Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Journal of Marketing Management on 13/06/2016, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/0267257X.2016.1186107>

### General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [open.access@hw.ac.uk](mailto:open.access@hw.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**Engaging and marketing to stakeholders in World Heritage Site management: A United Kingdom multiple case study perspective**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Marketing Management</i>
Manuscript ID	RJMM-2015-0259.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Article
Keywords (headings not selectable):	Arts & heritage marketing < Arts, social and not for profit marketing, Not for profit marketing < Arts, social and not for profit marketing, Destination branding < Brands, branding, corporate identity
Methodologies:	case study, interviewing, documentary evidence, analysis of
Free Response Keywords:	World Heritage Site Management, Stakeholder Engagement

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Only

## Engaging and marketing to stakeholders in World Heritage Site management: A United Kingdom multiple case study perspective

### Abstract

This research addresses the limited studies which apply stakeholder theory to World Heritage Site (WHS) management and managerial theory to heritage management. WHS management highlights a context where sites rely on numerous interests uniting through goodwill. This is intensified by the multiple ownership patterns which characterise many WHSs, necessitating a need for collective action. This study aims to explore how managers attempt to manage stakeholders and generate involvement and support. This study adopts a multiple case study approach, exploring three United Kingdom WHSs. Data was collected through interviews, documentation and physical artefacts. The analysis found that through representation, raising awareness and support, managers were able to generate stakeholder patronage. However, this required managers to look beyond informative engagement towards participatory means. Furthermore, the findings highlight the importance of the facilitators, time and money in successful stakeholder engagement. Lastly, conclusions, limitations and future research are offered.

Underpinned by stakeholder theory, this paper contributes to the understanding of stakeholder engagement within WHS management and adds to limited empirical studies on multiple sites. This investigation found that engagement is constrained by managers' limited time and resources. Furthermore, participatory engagement is essential in fostering stakeholders' responsibility for site management and developing relationships with managers.

### Key Words:

World Heritage, World Heritage Site Management, Stakeholders, Stakeholder Engagement

### Introduction

The necessity to manage and protect the world's most important historical sites has gained international attention, particularly through the establishment of World Heritage Sites (WHSs) (UNESCO, 2015a). Stemming from UNESCO's 1972 World Heritage Convention (WHC), a WHS is a place which is deemed to be of exceptional natural or cultural value to humanity. Central to their historical significance is that they are considered to be of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). OUV is the term UNESCO uses to describe the attributes of a WHS that contributes to its international significance. Furthermore, OUV also presumes that, universally, humanity shares the aspiration and responsibility to conserve and protect global heritage (UNESCO, 2015b). On becoming a WHS it is the responsibility of the receiving nation to ensure its protection and adhere to the WHC, with most sites developing a management plan and suitable management approach (UNESCO, 2015b).

Research into WHS management emphasises the importance of conservation and the need for effective managerial approaches to ensure these places are protected, with many studies stressing the significance of stakeholder collaboration (Aas, Ladkin, & Fletcher, 2005; Millar, 2006). A collaborative approach is also encouraged by UNESCO (2015b) who stress that nations are, 'encouraged to ensure the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders, including site managers, local and regional governments, local communities, non-governmental organizations and other interested parties and partners in...the protection of World Heritage properties.'

1  
2  
3 However, a collective approach is difficult due to numerous the organisations and  
4 multiple ownership patterns which characterise many WHSs and their management  
5 (Nicholas, Thapa, & Ko, 2009). Therefore, studies stress the complexities of stakeholder  
6 engagement and the conflicting agendas and tensions which render management  
7 problematic (Lefeuvre, 2007; Wager, 1995). Furthermore, research highlights the  
8 challenging relationship between site management and wider stakeholders such as building  
9 owners, businesses and local communities (da Cruz Vareiro, Remoaldo, & Ribeiro, 2012;  
10 Harrison, 2004b). However, stakeholders who are not involved or formally represented in  
11 site management structures play a vital role in WHS management. For example, they can  
12 provide or withhold resources such as time, capital, commitment and even properties  
13 (Garrod, Fyall, Leask, & Reid, 2011).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 In order to engage stakeholders and to foster collectivity, studies within  
31 management and marketing emphasise the creation of collaborative environments  
32 supported by representation, relationship building, communication and team working (Aas  
33 et al., 2005; Yuksel, Bramwell, & Yuksel, 1999). However, few heritage management studies,  
34 or indeed managers, embrace theories from general management (Baxter, 2012), while the  
35 ones that do often focus on tourism development (Nicholas et al., 2009). Furthermore,  
36 there are limited studies which provide a comparative analysis over a number of WHSs,  
37 especially in the United Kingdom (UK), with the exception of Landorf (2009) who explored  
38 the relationship between sustainable development and heritage tourism. However, Landorf  
39 (2009) simply focused on the content analysis of site documentation.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Importantly, stakeholder engagement at WHSs has also been a growing challenge for  
55 practicing managers. For example, in the UK, World Heritage has no formal status in terms  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of organisational administration and no additional financial assistance. Instead, protection is  
4  
5 administered through individual designations and the planning systems of the relevant  
6  
7 territory. Therefore, local authorities and public bodies are required to ensure that  
8  
9 appropriate legal regulations are in place to protect WHSs from harm and inappropriate  
10  
11 development. Given World Heritage's lack of formal status, site management is typically  
12  
13 reliant on the goodwill of various stakeholders coming together, regularly in an amorphous  
14  
15 fashion. In the UK, most sites function with an overarching managerial group comprised of  
16  
17 various interests, however structure and participation differs between sites. For example,  
18  
19 the Edinburgh's Old and New Towns WHS management group is made up of the City of  
20  
21 Edinburgh Council, Edinburgh World Heritage and Historic Scotland. On the other hand,  
22  
23 Hadrian's Wall WHS governance is provided by a management plan committee of over 40  
24  
25 representatives, ranging from academic interests to local authorities, farming and business  
26  
27 representatives, and non-departmental public bodies such as English Heritage and Natural  
28  
29 England. Given the multiple ownership patterns of many WHS in the UK, coupled with dense  
30  
31 and complex stakeholder networks, effective collaboration and site management is both  
32  
33 difficult and intricate for these managerial units (Bell, 2013).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 Furthermore, with tempestuous economic climate over previous years, the heritage  
43  
44 sector has been left victim to continual government funding cuts. One area which has  
45  
46 suffered has been WHS management. For example, in 2010 Stonehenge had £10million of  
47  
48 its public funding withdrawn (House of Commons, 2011), while in 2014 the Hadrian's Wall  
49  
50 Trust (the charity that helped maintain and promote Hadrian's Wall) closed due to cuts from  
51  
52 English Heritage and local authorities (BBC News, 2014). Given that site stakeholders are  
53  
54 potential suppliers of resources such as money, time, commitment and even properties,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 developing engagement and marketing strategies to enhance their involvement has never  
4  
5 been more important.  
6  
7

8  
9 Given these challenges, through a multiple case study approach, this research aims  
10  
11 to add to the limited quantity of investigations which apply stakeholder theory to the  
12  
13 context of WHS management and offer potential insight for industry practitioners. As such,  
14  
15 the purpose of this research is to explore how heritage managers administer and attempt to  
16  
17 generate stakeholder support and the extent of their success. The remainder of the paper is  
18  
19 organised as follows: the subsequent sections will outline the literature on stakeholder  
20  
21 theory and stakeholders in WHS management. This will be followed by a discussion on  
22  
23 methodology. The findings and discussion are then presented, followed by some concluding  
24  
25 remarks and managerial implications. Lastly, limitations and suggestions for future research  
26  
27 are offered.  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 33 **Literature review**

### 34 35 36 *Stakeholder engagement*

37  
38 The following section provides a general overview of stakeholder engagement and  
39  
40 its current application within managerial and marketing research. Stakeholder engagement  
41  
42 has become one of the most researched perspectives within managerial literature  
43  
44 (Freeman, 1984; Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). Stakeholders often hold varying amount of  
45  
46 power within their relationships with organisations (Friedman & Miles, 2002). Particularly,  
47  
48 they can supply or retract resources which organisations rely upon such as commitment,  
49  
50 time, money and property (Braganza, Stebbings, & Ngosi, 2013). Therefore, they can have  
51  
52 an influential impact on the functioning of an organisation and its performance (Sharma &  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Henriques, 2005). In response, the theory stresses the need for organisations to manage  
4  
5 these various interests through stakeholder engagement.  
6  
7

8  
9 Inlusiveness and comprehensiveness lie at the core of stakeholder engagement  
10  
11 (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). However, given the myriad of interests that characterise  
12  
13 organisations, balancing stakeholders is a byzantine process due to diverse and often  
14  
15 conflicting concerns (Garriga, 2014). Indeed, stakeholders can impact on an organisation's  
16  
17 reputation and functionality through coalitions, boycotts, legislation and word-of-mouth  
18  
19 (Dickinson-Delaporte, Beverland, & Lindgreen, 2010; Fry & Polonsky, 2004). In response,  
20  
21 careful planning, negotiation, inclusion and compromise are required when attempting to  
22  
23 engage in stakeholder relations (Bendheim, Waddock, & Graves, 1998). Nevertheless, others  
24  
25 argue that resource ownership and disparate levels of saliency constrain the balancing of  
26  
27 stakeholders (Lamin & Zaheer, 2012; Reynolds, Schultz, & Hekman, 2006). Therefore,  
28  
29 considering stakeholder interests is vital for managers (Rasche, 2012), with studies  
30  
31 highlighting the potency of engagement strategies as a means of managing them (Gardberg  
32  
33 & Newburry, 2013; Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2014).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Businesses are dependent on communication in engaging with stakeholders  
42  
43 (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003; Steyn, 2004). Typically through mediums such as experiences,  
44  
45 images, stories and concepts (Siano, Vollero, Confetto, & Siglioccolo, 2013; Stuart & Kerr,  
46  
47 1999), communications should focus on fostering favourable stakeholder relations in order  
48  
49 to augment their organisation's objectives, vision and reputation (Abratt & Kleyn, 2012;  
50  
51 Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Srivoravilai, Melewar, Liu, & Yannopoulou, 2011). Consequently,  
52  
53 managers can embrace reputation/impression management to engage stakeholders (Carter,  
54  
55 2006; Puncheva, 2008). Usually, such information is distributed through advertising,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 strategic documentation, and social media (Jones, Temperley, & Lima, 2009; Keller, 2001).  
4  
5 Others also highlight the importance of company websites to dispense information  
6  
7 regarding mission, objectives, ethics and actions (Esrock & Leichty, 2000; Jones et al., 2009).  
8  
9  
10 These approaches are significant in developing organisational understanding and  
11  
12 transparency through the availability of accurate and meaningful information (David, 2001;  
13  
14 Pirson & Malhotra, 2011), encouraging heightened stakeholder support for managerial  
15  
16 policies and actions (Gregory, 2007; Weber & Marley, 2012).  
17  
18  
19

20 Stakeholder events are also used to stimulate a shared understanding of an  
21  
22 organisation's objectives and action (Driessen, Kok, & Hillebrand, 2013; Perez-Batres, Doh,  
23  
24 Miller, & Pisani, 2012). However, this is challenging due to the complexity of conveying  
25  
26 messages to multiple stakeholders (Jawahar & McLaughlin, 2001; Schlegelmilch & Pollach,  
27  
28 2005). For example, while the organisation may be effective in reaching one stakeholder  
29  
30 group, others may misinterpret or derive a different understanding from the same message  
31  
32 (Paul, 2015). McVea and Freeman (2005) support this arguing that stakeholder theory  
33  
34 focuses too much on stakeholder roles rather than relationships with people with names  
35  
36 and faces. Resultantly, given that different stakeholders merit equal identification as human  
37  
38 beings, relationships should be humanised with commitment to giving them names and  
39  
40 faces (McVea and Freeman, 2005). Furthermore, companies' actions must complement the  
41  
42 communications, as their decisions and actions can counter the positive image projected by  
43  
44 them (De Chernatony, 1999).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Going beyond one way communications, others necessitate relationship building and  
52  
53 reciprocal engagement (Gregory, 2007). Therefore, engagement should focus on  
54  
55 relationships built upon integrity, trust and mutual appreciation (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011;  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Ulmer & Sellnow, 2000). Furthermore, bequeathing stakeholders with more responsibility  
4  
5 and decorum is more likely to nurture their support and contribution to organisational  
6  
7 policies (Wicks & Harrison, 2013; Zattoni, 2011). For example, giving stakeholders a voice in  
8  
9 decision-making processes promotes such relationships (Caton & Santos, 2007; Husted,  
10  
11 1998). Other strategies to enhance stakeholder patronage include: heightened participation,  
12  
13 coherent policies, a tolerance of differing locales, open communication, and a history of  
14  
15 trustworthiness (Anand & Rosen, 2008; Butterfield, Reed, & Lemak, 2004). This can also be  
16  
17 linked to ethical leadership, which suggests that managers can garner stakeholder support  
18  
19 and trust by honouring relationships and treating multiple interests legitimately and  
20  
21 equitably (Caldwell, Karri, & Vollmar, 2006; Hernandez, 2008).  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Representation as a means of building stakeholder relationships and legitimising  
28  
29 their interests is essential (Luoma and Goodstein, 1999; Moriarty, 2012). Polonsky and  
30  
31 Ottman (1998) indicate that formal interaction and cooperative approaches to stakeholder  
32  
33 engagement can ensure that the objectives of the organisation and its stakeholders are  
34  
35 attained. However, distrust can act as a barrier to such formal interactions being embraced.  
36  
37 This is supported by others who found that embracing collaborative mechanisms and  
38  
39 upholding stakeholder relationships based on trust will gain a competitive advantage over  
40  
41 organisations that do not, or organisations that base their unions on self-interest (Jones,  
42  
43 1995; Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2014). Philanthropy or providing support through  
44  
45 goodwill can also foster stakeholder patronage (Jia & Zhang, 2014, McAlister & Ferrell,  
46  
47 2002). For example, Haley (1991, p. 502) indicates that, 'contributions tell stories,  
48  
49 emphasize points, and display morals to stakeholders', and can be used as a mechanism to  
50  
51 ease potential stakeholder malpractice (Godfrey, 2005). Additionally, charitable  
52  
53 contributions have also been associated with heightened organisational performance (Wang  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 & Qian, 2011). However, related research warns of the risks of charitable support,  
4  
5 highlighting the agency and direct costs that occur in the long-term (Wang, Choi, & Li, 2008).  
6  
7

8  
9 What stakeholder theory expands is the overriding necessity for managers and  
10 organisations to look outside the internal workings of their firm towards the demands and  
11 interests from the external environment (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Provided that  
12 stakeholders can have an influential role over the functioning and performance of an  
13 organisation, awareness and strategies to appease and generate support from these  
14 external interests is important (Polonsky and Ottman, 1998). One area of research which  
15 has witnessed an intense debate surrounding stakeholders is in WHS management. The  
16 following section will highlight some of the main debates within this theme.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

#### 28 *Stakeholders in World Heritage Site management*

29  
30 The engagement of stakeholders in heritage management has been an important issue for  
31 both academics and practitioners. Particularly, complexities concerning stakeholders within  
32 WHS management have been widely discussed (Landorf, 2009; Su & Wall, 2012). This  
33 research often focusses on the necessity for site managers to administer and involve  
34 different interests ranging from: public and private bodies, businesses, local communities,  
35 private building owners and tourists (Haddad, Waheeb, & Fakhoury, 2009; Millar, 1989).  
36  
37 However, the task is difficult due to their differing agendas, roles and motivations (Harrison,  
38 2004a, 2004b; Harrison & Hitchcock, 2005). Furthermore, given that WHSs are typically  
39 characterised by large myriad stakeholders bases, some of which privately own assets,  
40 managers often face the challenge of administering places which they hold varying degrees  
41 of legitimacy (Aas et al., 2005).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Consequently, studies have emphasised the precarious nature of stakeholder relationships in WHS management (Bell, 2013; Wager, 1995). For instance, Haddad et al. (2009) indicate that WHSs can be consumed with negativity when local community involvement is minimal and there is a lack of cooperation between stakeholders. Regardless of these difficulties, stakeholder involvement and collaboration is fundamental to site management (Nicholas et al., 2009; Willis, 2009). For example, it is crucial in generating support, the pooling of resources, donations and volunteer help, and positive tourism development (Aas et al., 2005; Garrod et al., 2011). Given that many heritage sites are consumed with financial uncertainty (Silberberg, 1995), these benefits are vital for managers. For example, in the UK dwindling subsidies from the public sector has resulted in cuts to the heritage sector (BBC News, 2014).

Studies have identified strategies which managers can embrace in order to encourage collaborative environments which stimulate amicable relationships and conservational attitudes (Chiabai, Paskaleva, & Lombardi, 2011). These include: distinguishing and involving all potential stakeholders (González & Medina, 2003; The Heritage Lottery Fund, 2010), stakeholder representation within decision-making processes (Evans, 2002; Hitchcock, 2002; Xu and Dai, 2012), and open communication (Aas et al., 2005). Others promote the development of areas where views concerning site issues can be freely exchanged. For example, despite being under-utilised, Chiabai et al. (2011) and Lask and Herold (2004) both promote the creation of e-participation zones where site stakeholders can openly discuss ideas and concerns regarding how best to manage the site, allowing for more democratic decision-making and planning. Furthermore, Bell (2013) argues that site documentation, such as management plans, can offer a podium from which

1  
2  
3 to promote stakeholder collaboration. Despite this, Bell (2013) highlights that diverging  
4  
5 interests can act as a barrier to collaboration.  
6  
7

8  
9 Given the importance stakeholder place on the social meaning of heritage (The  
10 Heritage Lottery Fund, 2010), studies also propose the usefulness of events which  
11 encourage stakeholder participation. For example, McDonald (2011) argues that, once  
12 personally attached, individuals develop an enduring interest in conserving and protecting  
13 what is significant to them. Therefore, events and festivals could assist people in becoming  
14 more personally attached to their heritage, resulting in heightened public involvement  
15 (McDonald, 2011). Indeed, studies have also demonstrated and stressed the importance of  
16 heritage as means of enriching peoples' lives through tackling societal problems and  
17 enhancing the lives of vulnerable people (The Heritage Lottery Fund, 2015).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 In exploring the challenges of stakeholders in WHS management a number of studies  
32 have embraced stakeholder theory. This includes: Chiabai et al. (2011) examining cultural  
33 tourism management and tourism, Nicholas et al. (2009) to investigate local community  
34 support for the Pitons Management Area as a WHS and tourism, Garrod et al. (2011) to  
35 explore the intensions and practices of local community engagement at Scottish tourism  
36 attractions, and Aas et al. (2005) to study the relationships between locals, heritage  
37 managers and tourism at Luang Prabang. These authors imply that conditions that foster  
38 inclusion, collaboration and empowerment in site management should be created in order  
39 to encourage an environment where shared decision-making and shared understandings  
40 ensue (Aas et al., 2005; Nicholas et al., 2009). For example, Garrod et al. (2011) found that  
41 approaches to engaging communities focused more on appeasing them through informative  
42 participation, rather than allowing them to have a role in decision-making processes.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Overall, these studies argue that collective environments must be developed so that  
4  
5 different stakeholder interests can work together to better protect heritage through trust,  
6  
7 communal accountability, and mutual relationships (Bell, 2013; Nicholas et al., 2009).  
8  
9

10  
11 Despite these proposed strategies, there are challenges which create barriers to  
12  
13 collaborative environments becoming apparent. For example, Yuksel and Yuksel (2008)  
14  
15 found that clientelism discourages stakeholder participation. Therefore, if stakeholders  
16  
17 perceive public organisations' actions to be negative or unfair, and so damaging its  
18  
19 legitimacy and credibility, support and participation for its activities and planning are often  
20  
21 lost. Therefore, administrative bodies must consider community concerns and perceptions  
22  
23 of equity in decision-making and planning (Erdogan & Tosun, 2009). Furthermore,  
24  
25 stakeholder involvement and collaboration is problematic due to: conflicting interests  
26  
27 (Bender & Edmonds, 1992; van der Aa, Groote, & Huigen, 2004), power being held by the  
28  
29 few elites (Harrison, 2004b), groups being overlooked and not immersed into decision-  
30  
31 making processes and barriers to participation (Haddad et al., 2009; Wager, 1995).  
32  
33 Additionally, even when stakeholders are involved success is not always certain. For  
34  
35 instance, van der Aa et al. (2004) argue that even if stakeholders identify the benefits of  
36  
37 conserving heritage, if they do not see any personal benefits they will often lose interest in  
38  
39 World Heritage issues or become disengaged with management.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 While stakeholders at WHSs have been the centre of academic attention, little  
48  
49 attention has been placed on applying managerial theory to the context of heritage  
50  
51 management (Baxter, 2012). Due to the severely limited amount of studies which apply  
52  
53 stakeholder theory to the context of WHS management, and the pressures facing heritage  
54  
55 managers in an ever increasing tempestuous economic climate, the present research will  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 explore how heritage managers administer and attempt to generate stakeholder support  
4  
5 from those stakeholders outside the management approach to their site, and the extent of  
6  
7 their success. Although research has used stakeholder theory in the past, these studies have  
8  
9 focused principally on the relationship of tourism and local community involvement.  
10  
11 Therefore, a more holistic study is proposed, using stakeholder theory to focus on the  
12  
13 general management of WHSs rather than through the lens of tourism. To do this a multiple  
14  
15 case study approach will be employed, exploring three UK WHS's. The following section will  
16  
17 outline this study's chosen methodological approach.  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 Methodology

23  
24  
25 Currently, there are 1031 WHSs, with 29 in the UK. Consequently, it would be impractical to  
26  
27 justify a study into one isolated site, and therefore, a multiple-case research design was  
28  
29 employed (Stake, 1995). Multiple case studies have become increasingly popular within  
30  
31 management and marketing research (Falay, Salimäki, Ainamo, & Gabrielsson, 2007; Helfen  
32  
33 & Sydow, 2013). The choice of a multiple case approach was grounded in its proposed  
34  
35 benefits. This includes the acceptance that case research is more effective when multiple,  
36  
37 rather than single, cases are explored (Merriam, 1998), and that they are an ideal approach  
38  
39 in developing contributions to inadequately understood knowledge (Stake, 1995).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 As this study aims to investigate the limited use of stakeholder theory within WHS  
46  
47 management, a multiple case approach seems most appropriate in order to unearth more  
48  
49 understanding of the phenomenon in question. Multiple case researchers will often use  
50  
51 between three and twelve cases (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Swan & Scarbrough, 2005),  
52  
53 with selection based on the 'opportunity to learn' (Stake, 1995). Therefore, case selection  
54  
55 was based on what would help enlighten the focus of the investigation. Due to the high  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 number of WHSs, this study chose to concentrate on UK sites. Secondly, sites were selected  
4  
5 based on ownership structure as places under sole proprietorship would have less  
6  
7 significance to the proposed research. Therefore, sites which are characterised by multiple  
8  
9 ownership patterns were selected. In the UK, there are numerous WHSs that are  
10  
11 characterized by multiple ownership patterns. Examples include: Hadrian's Wall, the City of  
12  
13 Bath, Ironbridge Gorge, Edinburgh's Old and New Towns, the Derwent Valley Mills, and the  
14  
15 Antonine Wall. Initially, the author contacted potential interviewees from a number of UK  
16  
17 WHSs. Ultimately, site selection was grounded in the willingness and level of participation  
18  
19 from managers across potential sites. Overviews of the selected WHSs are presented in  
20  
21 Table 1.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Table 1** Case study sites description

Site	Description
Edinburgh's Old and New Towns	<p>This site was inscribed as a WHS due to its reflection of noteworthy changes in urban planning in Europe. The site's OUV lies in its juxtaposition of two historical areas: the Old and New Towns. The divergence between the organic medieval Old Town and the planned Georgian New Town presents a transparent urban structure which is unrivalled throughout Europe. Over 75% of the site's buildings are listed for the architectural or historic importance, while it is also home to 25,000 residents as well as numerous businesses and public and private organisations. The WHS is managed by a partnership consisting of Historic Scotland, the City of Edinburgh Council and Edinburgh World Heritage (EWH). EWH is a private charitable body (funding from donations, Edinburgh City Council and Historic Scotland) which is responsible for the implementing of the management plan and the work of the WHS steering group. Made up of professionals with differing expertise, this organisation operates at arms-length from the public sector.</p>
The Antonine Wall	<p>Listed in 2008 as part of the 'The Frontiers of the Roman Empire' WHS, the Antonine Wall was erected over 2000 years ago on the orders of Emperor Antoninus Pius. The OUV of the site is not only reflective of its representation of human creativity, but also in its historical</p>

---

importance to the interchange of human values and its rare testament to a faded civilisation and culture. Today, much of the site has been lost to time, built developments and farming. However, spots are still visible, for example, at Rough Castle and the Bearsden Bath House. Furthermore, the site encompasses multiple ownership patterns and is characterised by numerous communities, businesses, public and private organisations, and farmland. The site is managed by a group consisting of Historic Scotland, East Dunbartonshire Council, North Lanarkshire Council, Falkirk Council, Glasgow City Council, and West Dunbartonshire Council. The site is reliant on a sole WHS Coordinator supplied by Historic Scotland.

The Derwent Valley Mills A WHS since 2001, this site contains a series of eighteenth and nineteenth century cotton mills and an industrial landscape of historical significance. Home to the famous Arkwright System, the site's OUV stems from being the birth place of the factory system and the first modern industrial settlement. Today, spanning 24km, the mills and the majority of the workers homes are intact and illustrate the areas socio-economic development. There are over 800 listed buildings within the WHS. The site is also home to thousands of residents, businesses and public/private organisations. Site management is shared by a number of local authorities and government bodies. The coordination of these interests is provided through a Board and Partnership Forum containing various site

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

stakeholders. The site also has a dedicated WHS team funded by Derbyshire Council. This includes: a director, coordinator, learning and events coordinator, development coordinator, and a business service assistant.

---

For Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3 As emphasised previously, WHSs are administered by distinctive arrangements, with  
4 their overarching management typically consisting of various groups with differing interests  
5 and remits coming together through goodwill and meeting on an intermittent basis.  
6  
7 Therefore, clarity in what is meant by heritage managers requires comment. In regards to  
8 this study, heritage managers are defined as being those individuals who have a formal role  
9 within the WHS management group. These individuals are representatives of the entities  
10 which are outlined in Table 1.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 An advantage of case study research is that it often embraces the use of multiple  
21 sources of evidence (Yin, 2009). Given the qualitative nature of this study, data was  
22 collected through three avenues: semi-structured interviews, documentation, and psychical  
23 artefacts. Semi-structured interviews were the primary source of evidence in this study.  
24 Noted for their flexibility, they are ideal for gathering large amount of qualitative data, often  
25 through encouraging the interviewee to go beyond simple answers and even discuss areas  
26 of interest which were unplanned (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Jackson, 2012).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 As WHS management structures often encompasses different organisations and  
37 interests, the openness and flexible nature of semi-structured interviews seems beneficial in  
38 uncovering the complexities and nature of the phenomenon through the views of differing  
39 managers. Therefore, this approach, through managers going beyond simple responses,  
40 would hopefully permit the collection of multiple-perspectives across the different sites.  
41 Interview data was gathered over a period of five months across the three sites.  
42 Interviewees were recruited through judgmental sampling (Panneerselvam, 2004). The logic  
43 behind this sampling approach is its ability to select the most appropriate individuals for the  
44 research (Herbst & Coldwell, 2004). As such, key administrative figures in each sites WHS  
45 management approach were identified and contacted for a possible interview. Identification  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 was facilitated through site documentation and through online mediums, with a total of 30  
4  
5 interviews conducted. An interview guide was used to ensure that relevant information was  
6  
7 collected (King, 2004a). The questions in this guide were devised through the information  
8  
9 presented in the literature review. After each interview, each interviewee was offered to  
10  
11 inspect the interpretations of their responses. Known as member checking, this process is  
12  
13 seen as an effective way to provide accuracy and validity of the study's findings (Anand,  
14  
15 Gardner, & Morris, 2007).  
16  
17

18  
19 Documents were also a main source of evidence. This included the management  
20  
21 plans and strategic documentation of each WHS. Access to this documentation was  
22  
23 unproblematic as each WHS make them publically available on their respected website.  
24  
25 These websites also offered access to news feeds which highlighted past site specific news  
26  
27 and future events. These documents also provided detailed contextual information that  
28  
29 helped illuminate the process and structures of the study's context (Mattarelli & Tagliaventi,  
30  
31 2012). Physical artefacts, or tangible evidence, were also used to inform the research  
32  
33 process (Oliver & Roos, 2007). In this study, photographs taken at the case sites were used  
34  
35 to support the narrative and supplement the evidence collected from the other methods.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 In terms of data analysis, this study followed the basic expectations of multiple case  
42  
43 research - within-case case investigation followed by cross-case examination (Eisenhardt,  
44  
45 1989). In analysing the collected information, an inductive approach known as template  
46  
47 analysis was embraced (Crabtree & Miller, 1999). In this approach codes are firstly identified  
48  
49 'a priori', extracted from the literature and refer to particular themes which characterise a  
50  
51 theory or area of interest. This provides the researcher with a reasonably clear direction to  
52  
53 follow when structuring the examination of the collected evidence and its presentation  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(Silverman, 2005). Template analysis also allows codes to be included 'a posteriori', meaning themes can be reformed or other integrated as they emerge from the analysis of the data (King, 2004b). The a priori themes which guided this study include: representation, raising awareness, support, and the influence of engagement. These themes were derived from the literature review on stakeholder theory presented in this paper and underline some of the fundamental approaches that managers use to engage prospective stakeholders. The analysis of current studies on stakeholders in WHS management also emphasised the potency of these themes. Additional themes, which emerged from the data, were also added as the research developed. These were identified as the facilitators, time and resources. Using these themes as a structure, the following section will present the findings and discussion of this study.

## Case studies

### *Representation and raising awareness*

Across the sites, representation and raising awareness are essential ingredients in submerging stakeholder interests into organisational decision-making, notably through document consultation on their management plans<sup>1</sup>. As one Antonine Wall manager highlights, *'it's community led...we're trying to deliver and look after the Wall from the bottom up.'* Furthermore, one Derwent manager indicates, *'you are doing something on the ground rather than just sitting in an office saying, "Well, this is the policy. Go away and read it", you're empowering people to decide what they think is important.'* This confers with

---

<sup>1</sup> Edinburgh World Heritage Steering Group (2012) *The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site: Management Plan 2011-2016*, Edinburgh World Heritage Steering Group, Edinburgh. Derwent Valley Mills Partnership (2002) *DVMWHS Management Plan 2002-2007*, Derwent Valley Mills Partnership, Derbyshire, Historic Scotland (2007, p.64) *The AW Nomination and Management Plan 2007-2012*, Historic Scotland, Edinburgh

1  
2  
3 existing studies on stakeholder theory that argues that managers must embrace  
4 collaborative mechanisms which enable dialogue between themselves and stakeholders  
5 (Anand & Rosen, 2008; Gregory, 2007). Such collaboration enables site management  
6 characterised through compromise and negotiation (Harrison, 2004b; Nicholas et al., 2009).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 While representation is acknowledged as important, managers raised concerns over  
14 consultative mechanisms, highlighting limited community ownership and trust. As one  
15 Antonine Wall manager states, *'there's a real lack of engagement. The management*  
16 *approach has no community reps...there needs to be a more effective mechanism or they will*  
17 *just lose interest.'* Additionally, one Edinburgh manager suggests a lack of faith in the  
18 process emphasising that, *'sometimes a lot of results of these consultations go down the*  
19 *back of a sofa and nothing actually happens and that's where the trust is lost.'* These  
20 apprehensions resonate with the view that stakeholders will lack confidence to participate  
21 and avoid engagement if they sense that their views are overlooked (Jones, 1995; Yuksel &  
22 Yuksel, 2008). However, such concerns should seem expected given that Edinburgh  
23 managers admit that the conclusions of some consultation processes are disregarded,  
24 highlighting levels of clientelism in planning (Erdogan & Tosun, 2009).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 For heritage sites to be managed effectively, excretion should be made to  
43 encompass all relevant stakeholders in planning and decision-making (González & Medina,  
44 2003). However, the Antonine and Edinburgh cases emphasised limited levels of wider  
45 stakeholder representation, highlighting a lost opportunity. For example, Landorf (2009)  
46 indicates that, beyond draft stages of strategic documentation, a lack of grassroots  
47 involvement of stakeholders in management is a wasted opening. Interestingly, at the  
48 Antonine Wall wider stakeholder inclusion was surprisingly undesirable among some  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 managers who believed that representation in the formal management structure should be  
4  
5 based on perceived responsibility. As one manager argued, *'they don't need to be on there*  
6  
7 *[management structure] because they don't have any responsibilities for the Wall's*  
8  
9 *management'*. Undesirably, this emphasises a common problem in stakeholder theory and  
10  
11 WHS management where support diminishes in the face of planning and decision-making  
12  
13 being isolated to an influential few – typically government officials (Harrison, 2004a; Zattoni,  
14  
15 2011).  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 At the Derwent Valley, representation has been developed and goes beyond simple  
22  
23 consultation to also include informal cluster groups containing local residents, business and  
24  
25 interest groups. These clusters allow wider stakeholders to have a voice and to exchange  
26  
27 ideas on site management, while the processes allow managers to raise conciseness the  
28  
29 historical significance of the site. As one manager highlights, *'lots of the interests engage in*  
30  
31 *the cluster groups ...and those people are really enthusiastic because they feel involved and*  
32  
33 *that they're making a difference.'* These clusters have had some success, for example  
34  
35 creating the WHS's ambassador scheme<sup>2</sup>. The importance of this finding reinforces other  
36  
37 studies which also promote the immersion of stakeholders into more site management  
38  
39 activities (Caton & Santos, 2007; Xu & Dai, 2012), and creating areas where managers and  
40  
41 interests interact to debate concerns freely (Anand & Rosen, 2008; Gregory, 2007).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Through these forms of representation managers have also been able to raise  
49  
50 stakeholder awareness to their historical surroundings. For example, raising awareness of  
51  
52 each site's WHS status and OUV is at the heart of the sites management plans and their  
53  
54

---

55  
56 <sup>2</sup> The 'Belper Ambassador Training Scheme' encompassed business owners and their employees completing a  
57  
58 two hour guided walk of their local town, educating them about the WHS and where local amenities and  
59  
60 family activities could be located. Those who took part received a Derwent Valley WHS vinyl for their shop  
window, specifying they were visitor friendly.



1  
2  
3 consultative processes<sup>3</sup>. Indeed, stakeholder research highlights the magnitude of  
4  
5 employing strategies to elevate awareness and support (Abratt & Kleyn, 2012; Keller, 2001,  
6  
7 Weber & Marley, 2012). Across the cases various other strategies have been implemented  
8  
9 to build awareness and enhance the reputation of the site and its management. Research  
10  
11 highlights the necessity for organisations to embrace multiple forms of engagement  
12  
13 strategies in order to reinforce their actions and generate validation of their mission and  
14  
15 values (Gardberg & Newburry, 2013; Srivoravilai et al., 2011). Table 1 provides an overview  
16  
17 of engagement strategies used by each site.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54 <sup>3</sup> Derwent Valley Mills Partnership (2013) *DVMWHS Management Plan 2013-2018*, Derwent Valley Mills  
55 Partnership, Derbyshire. Edinburgh World Heritage Steering Group (2012) *The Old and New Towns of*  
56 *Edinburgh World Heritage Site: Management Plan 2011-2016*, Edinburgh World Heritage Steering Group,  
57 Edinburgh. Historic Scotland (2007) *The AW Nomination and Management Plan 2007-2012*, Historic Scotland,  
58 Edinburgh  
59  
60

**Table 2** Engagement strategies employed across the WHSs

Strategies	Site
Online	All the sites have a webpage dedicated to providing information
Presence	concerning: management and contacts, latest news feeds, access to documentation, links to attractions, and events calendars. Unlike the Antonine Wall, both the Edinburgh and Derwent sites have a social media presence on Facebook and Twitter.
Events	All three sites have organised events which promote their WHSs. For example, all three organise a range of activities for Discovery Days events, including access to often inaccessible buildings, tours, talks, and exhibitions.
Community projects	Unlike the Antonine Wall, the Edinburgh and Derwent sites organise many projects which engage with stakeholders. For example, EWH has organised projects which involve community mapping and workshops for building owners on issues such as energy efficiency. Likewise, the Derwent site undertakes ventures such as the 2012 'Thread's' project. This project was organised for older generations to work with local children on a visual arts venture.
Publications	The Edinburgh and Derwent sites both publish various forms of media to highlight site activities, achievements and undertakings by the management group. This includes: monthly journals and newsletters, annual reports, latest news feeds, and notes from WHS staff.
Branded	The Derwent Valley and Antonine Wall have both developed branded

1  
2  
3 signage signage across their sites. Furthermore, all three sites have a distinct  
4  
5 logo which is encouraged to be used throughout their sites.  
6  
7 Educational All sites have developed learning materials, especially for  
8  
9 materials schoolchildren and have organised events which engage and educate  
10  
11 younger generations about their WHS. For example: World Heritage  
12  
13 Skills Taster Sessions (Edinburgh), local school presentations (Derwent),  
14  
15 familiarisation trips (Antonine).  
16  
17  
18  
19

---

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Managers indicate that the strategies highlighted in Table 2 are vital in publicising  
4  
5 and building an understanding of their site and reinforcing WHS status (Hatch & Schultz,  
6  
7 1997; McDonald, 2011). As one manager stated, *'you need to capture people's attention, we*  
8  
9 *need them to be involved and that's what these strategies do...they can provide help and*  
10  
11 *money and that's key...so their support and cooperation is essential.'* Across the sites,  
12  
13 managers agreed about the usefulness of their engagement strategies. Commenting on the  
14  
15 value of branded signage (see Figure 1a), a Derwent manager argues that, *'people see the*  
16  
17 *logo, recognise they are in a WHS...it's important because it validates what we do. It can*  
18  
19 *inspire potential volunteers and contributors.'*  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Figure 1 Example of Derwent Valley Mills branded signage (Taken by author)



er Review Only

1  
2  
3 Another manager stresses the importance of community based events highlighting  
4  
5 that, *'it's about getting people together in groups, making friends, and seeing each other at*  
6  
7 *different events. They are getting together, working together, being more involved.'*  
8  
9  
10 Specifically, the need to communicate and build awareness throughout WHS stakeholder  
11  
12 networks is recognised to be essential in generating community and business support (Lask  
13  
14 & Herold, 2004; Puncheva, 2008), especially when some are oblivious to the historical  
15  
16 potency of their surroundings. One avenue in which community and business involvement  
17  
18 and awareness is encouraged is through levels of stakeholder support.  
19  
20

### 21 22 *Support*

23  
24 According to perspectives on stakeholder theory, offering support as a means of  
25  
26 engagement is essential (Jia & Zhang, 2014). Given that the WHSs in this study encompass  
27  
28 diverse interests and that many of their buildings and land are under private ownership, this  
29  
30 is significant. Across the WHSs support for stakeholders is apparent and comes in various  
31  
32 forms, however is more evident at the Edinburgh and Derwent sites.  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 At Edinburgh, support is offered through their conservation funding programme  
39  
40 which offers financial assistance to private, business and public owners to help protect and  
41  
42 maintain their buildings; as well as business support through the production of a World  
43  
44 Heritage Business Opportunities Guide. Support is also provided through publications and  
45  
46 workshops which offer home owners guidance on building maintenance in the areas of  
47  
48 ironmongery, paintwork and roofs.<sup>4</sup> Other supportive projects include community based  
49  
50 ventures which give residents a leading role in site management. For example, this includes  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 <sup>4</sup> Edinburgh World Heritage Steering Group (2012) *The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site:*  
58 *Management Plan 2011-2016*, Edinburgh World Heritage steering group, Edinburgh  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Granny's Green and the Graveyards Projects<sup>5</sup>. This often results in collaborative  
4  
5 partnerships which include many commercial, public, private charitable and community  
6  
7 organisations. One manager emphasises the value of support suggesting, *'we can't do any*  
8  
9 *project without buy-in from the community...that's why support is essential. Everything that*  
10  
11 *we do is done as a result of collaboration.'* Furthermore, projects also entail additional  
12  
13 benefits such as: work experience for the unemployed, sustaining traditional building skills,  
14  
15 and reducing vandalism and crime through increased footfall in once publically avoided  
16  
17 areas.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22  
23 At Derwent, support is equally important. As one manager stated, *'you can lead the*  
24  
25 *horse to water but you can't necessarily make them appreciate what's on their*  
26  
27 *doorstep...project working is one way in which we can do this.'* Along with potential funding  
28  
29 for building owners, managers highlight the support for local businesses such as website and  
30  
31 podcasting training for Mill employees.<sup>6</sup> Another initiative aimed at creating 'WHS  
32  
33 volunteers' rather than being dedicated to a particular place, for example the Cromford  
34  
35 Mills. Through familiarisation trips and training, volunteers across the WHS were educated  
36  
37 on the site's historical significance, encouraging them to volunteer in other parts. One  
38  
39 manager highlighted the merit of this, arguing that, *'it gives them personal responsibility for*  
40  
41 *the whole site and when you see the sort of incredible job they've done, its testament to the*  
42  
43 *dedication of those people.'* Another manager stresses the social implications of the project:  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

---

52  
53 <sup>5</sup> Granny's Green: With the support of EWH and ECC and a £25,000 grant, the Patrick Geddes Gardening Club  
54 converted an old disused space in the Grassmarket (Granny's Green) into an active community space and  
55 garden. Graveyards Projects: Through community leadership this projects aimed to increase footfall and  
56 awareness of Edinburgh's graveyards. Supported by EWH and ECC, these graveyards are to be community led  
57 and managed.

58 <sup>6</sup> Derwent Valley Mills Partnership (2013) *DVMWHS Management Plan 2013-2018*, Derwent Valley Mills  
59 Partnership, Derbyshire  
60

1  
2  
3 *'It's sociable...even though the project is finished we meet every two or three months and we*  
4  
5 *go for some food afterwards'.*  
6  
7

8  
9 Support, whether it is financial or informative, is implied to be an effective approach  
10 in developing stakeholder support (McAlister & Ferrell, 2002), highlighting both the moral  
11 and responsible nature of the organisation. Furthermore, these findings also support other  
12 studies which argue that WHS management is dependent on local communities and wider  
13 interests receiving the necessary support in order to benefit from WHS status (Harrison &  
14 Hitchcock, 2005). Significantly, Edinburgh and Derwent managers stress the collaborative  
15 nature of these endeavours, as well as the economic and social benefits such as: work  
16 experience for the unemployed, maintaining traditional skills and reducing vandalism. This is  
17 supported by similar research which argues that stakeholder support at WHSs can be  
18 heightened if they perceive the benefits of listing and how it can positively contribute to  
19 their lives (Hampton, 2005).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 These supportive mechanisms are also vital in augmenting stakeholder involvement,  
36 representation and awareness across the sites. Importantly, both the Edinburgh and  
37 Derwent sites highlight forms of engagement which go beyond a single point of contact to  
38 incorporate a more enduring form of engagement. This is highlighted in Edinburgh's  
39 community projects (such as the Graveyards and Granny's Green projects) and at the  
40 Derwent Valley, where continual engagement is embraced through informal congregations  
41 after events have ended. Edinburgh's projects also highlight managers encouraging  
42 community stakeholders to take personal responsibility for their surroundings. These  
43 approaches highlight how mechanisms which encourage stakeholder responsibility for  
44 elements of site management and continual interaction are vital in building meaningful  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 relationships with stakeholders (Caton & Santos, 2007; Heugens, van den Bosch, & van Riel,  
4  
5 2002).  
6  
7

### 8 *Influence of engagement* 9

10 Across the sites, especially Edinburgh and Derwent, engagement strategies have resulted in  
11  
12 numerous benefits. Firstly, managers have formed relationships based on trust with  
13  
14 stakeholders. As one Edinburgh manager states, *'We have done so many projects now that*  
15  
16 *people trust us. If the trust lasts then so does their propensity to act in a responsible way.'*  
17  
18

19 One Derwent manager also indicates: *'We've managed to build relationships and trust with*  
20  
21 *them. Even after projects are done we have people calling us and wanting to help.'* Some of  
22  
23 these relationships are also based on friendship. For example, one manager states, *'Through*  
24  
25 *working on the ground you speak to different people, and there is a lot of friendship*  
26  
27 *there....It has been built over the years.'* Site managers also highlight how stakeholders have  
28  
29 become more conservational minded. As one Edinburgh manager argues, *'Being involved in*  
30  
31 *a specific project which has an outcome...people see the difference they have made. It makes*  
32  
33 *them more connected to their heritage.'*  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 These findings support stakeholder theory research which suggests that managers  
41  
42 must embrace fairness in decision-making and that to not to do so would diminish the  
43  
44 opportunity for sustainable stakeholder relationships (Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2013). Closely  
45  
46 related to trust, these managers have also highlighted that personal and affective  
47  
48 relationships have been nurtured with stakeholders. Relationship building is an important  
49  
50 element of stakeholder engagement (Jones, 1995), and is pivotal in fostering stakeholder  
51  
52 backing (Wicks & Harrison, 2013). Significantly, Edinburgh and Derwent managers both  
53  
54 stress the importance of reinforcing relationships through events and informal meetings to  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ensure that unions are not lost and instead built upon. As one manager highlights: *'They get*  
4 *invited to our events. You initially start off with peoples own kind of self-interest but then by*  
5 *working with us you become part of our network and the bigger picture begins to emerge*  
6 *and it really does reinforce with people.'* The importance of reinforcing personal  
7 relationships, and the significance of friendships, emphasises significant theoretical calls to  
8 examine stakeholders as humans rather than concepts (McVea & Freeman, 2005). For  
9 example, research has suggested that stakeholders as people with 'faces and feelings' are  
10 often overlooked and that more focus must be placed on humanising the process, as is  
11 demonstrative through the focus on intimate relationships in the Edinburgh and Derwent  
12 cases (McVea & Freeman, 2005).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Both the Edinburgh and Derwent cases also highlight how through engagement the  
28 concept of 'World Heritage' has been more appreciated. For example, managers have seen  
29 businesses become more engaged with World Heritage, with many incorporating the site  
30 logo on their webpages. As one managers states, *'the World Heritage bit will be something*  
31 *they pick up as part of the process...creating that network is essential and it means people*  
32 *interact with you and support the whole idea of World Heritage.'* Both Evans (2004) and  
33 Jimura (2011) imply that identification with World Heritage and a sites historical potency  
34 can be an influential factor in elevating stakeholder patronage.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Vitality, the Edinburgh and Derwent environments are also supported by the  
48 informative mechanisms such as social media, publications and latest news through their  
49 respective websites. This information dissemination is important as organisations must  
50 support their actions and strategies through information availability as a means of  
51 augmenting transparency, trust and ultimately support (David, 2001; Driessen et al., 2013).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In Edinburgh, engagement through project working is commented on to have healed  
4  
5 once fractured relationships with stakeholders. For example, the Granny's Green project  
6  
7 resulted in local communities and ECC working together in a more congruous way. As one  
8  
9 manager stresses, *'it showed the Council that the community were actually genuinely*  
10  
11 *interested, and it showed those people that the Council would listen. It's brought the*  
12  
13 *community and the Council closer together.'* Therefore, the findings highlights that such  
14  
15 commitment has been developed through participatory engagement, beyond that of  
16  
17 informative or consultative means (Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2014; Zattoni, 2011).  
18  
19 Previous studies stress that stakeholders are more likely to have respect and consideration  
20  
21 for an organisation's endeavours, and to be supportive of their mission, if they have an  
22  
23 active role in its administration (Butterfield et al., 2004; Hampton, 2005). The strategies  
24  
25 employed by the Edinburgh and Derwent's sites both contribute to this becoming a reality,  
26  
27 encouraged through approaches which allow for stakeholder immersion into their sites  
28  
29 managerial environments as active participants.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Managers in Edinburgh and Derwent claim this commitment and trust has  
38  
39 contributed to the donation of money and time to site endeavours, and offering assistance.  
40  
41 For example one Edinburgh manager comments on the monetary donations and time being  
42  
43 committed from stakeholders, highlighting, *'Because we deliver and support these groups*  
44  
45 *and engage with them, it has really brought everyone together. People are willing to help*  
46  
47 *each other out whether it is time, money or a bit of support.'* Such findings correspond with  
48  
49 stakeholder research which argues that, through immersion into managerial activities,  
50  
51 stakeholder commitment can be heightened through feelings of community spirit and pride  
52  
53  
54  
55 (Jimura, 2011; Pirson & Malhotra, 2011).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *The facilitators*

Across each site, the WHS coordinator and/or dedicated site team were significant in engaging and building relationships with stakeholders. Focus on specific individuals or teams are currently overlooked within existing perspectives on stakeholder theory. Therefore, 'who' the people are that are engaging with the stakeholders is not given authority. Rather focus is one of the identifying strategies used by the organisations and their subsequent impact. Analysis of the site evidence suggests that this is an important omission when exploring stakeholder engagement. Managers found the presence of these figures essential given that the management structures to their sites consisted of representatives from various organisations who only met on an intermittent basis. Instead, these teams or the WHS coordinator were fulltime staff dedicated to WHS issues. In this study's cases, this would be the Antonine Wall Coordinator, the Derwent WHS team, and EWH. Each is regarded as essential in championing and delivering the management plan, a facilitator to relationship building, and directing communal action. For example one manager highlights the dedication of EWH, stating, *'They do an awful lot of work with so many people, their work has bound interest together, without them I don't think the commitment would be there.'*

Such views are also highlighted in the Derwent and Antonine Wall cases. As one Derwent manager states, *'[the Team] they do so much extra work, purely voluntarily and they're absolutely dedicated. It's that determination that's made this network of relationships happen and continue to function.'* Similar views are held at the Antonine Wall of the site coordinator. For example, one manager claims, *'[the coordinator] does so much*

1  
2  
3 *work...without her and the amount of work she does there wouldn't be as much support and*  
4  
5 *involvement, she brings everyone along and it's her passion that's the driving force.'*  
6  
7

8  
9 While studies reflect on the importance of managers as central figures in building  
10 relationships with stakeholders (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011), the action of these individuals  
11 highlights forms of ethical leadership (Caldwell et al., 2006) which is argued to be essential  
12 in developing followers among stakeholders (Hernandez, 2008). Furthermore, this finding  
13 adds to current studies of WHS management which despite highlighting the need for  
14 collective environments and stakeholder engagement (Aas et al., 2005; Nicholas et al., 2009)  
15 tend to provide little reflection on the role of the WHS coordinator or dedicated team.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 *Time and resources*

25  
26 While managers at Edinburgh and Derwent emphasise the benefits of engagement,  
27  
28 Antonine Wall managers highlighted little perceived heightened stakeholder patronage  
29 beyond groups that had always been interested in the Wall. Concerns regarding money and  
30 time were stressed to be underlying factors. These issues affect the intensity of the levels of  
31 representation, marketing activities and support offered by site managers. Studies in  
32 heritage often comment on the financial challenges faced by managers (Garrod et al., 2011),  
33 however, existing perspectives on stakeholder theory predominately overlook the issue of  
34 money, apart from a few instances (Jawahar & McLaughlin, 2001). The findings of this study  
35 offer a more insightful perspective of the value of money as a means of enabling and  
36 preventing stakeholder engagement.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Given the size of the WHSs in this study and their myriads of stakeholders,  
53 substantial resources are required to enable effective engagement. However, the findings  
54 stressed that the turbulent economic environment, and reliance on public sector funding,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 has acted as a barrier to engagement, especially in the Antonine case. For example, a lack of  
4  
5 resources has meant that managers have been limited in their ability to engage stakeholders  
6  
7 through more formal forms of representation or through supportive measures. As one  
8  
9 Antonine manager stressed, *'You need to remember we are an under-resourced WHS...we*  
10  
11 *had the financial crash and there's been very little resources to do anything.'*  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 This challenge not only highlights the problematic nature of the link between money  
17  
18 and stakeholder theory, but it also unearths the issue of the differing levels managerial  
19  
20 capabilities across the sites. While Edinburgh and Derwent have gained heightened  
21  
22 stakeholder patronage through project working and support, the Antonine Wall cannot  
23  
24 embrace or afford such intense and continual engagement. Unlike the Edinburgh and  
25  
26 Derwent sites that are financed through their managerial groups, Antoine Wall managers  
27  
28 are restricted in their managerial capabilities due to limited staff capacity and resources.  
29  
30 This has ultimately influenced their potential to elevate stakeholder patronage. As one  
31  
32 manager argued, *'The site is so large that it's difficult to develop relationships. We just don't*  
33  
34 *have the staff capacity or financial means to undertake different engagement approaches.'*  
35  
36  
37 As a result, managers highlight levels of apprehension towards the management partners.  
38  
39 Such difficulties are highlighted by similar studies which suggest that a lack of managerial  
40  
41 support can lead to mistrust and a lack of faith in the organisations abilities and intensions  
42  
43 (O'Connell, Stephens, Betz, Shepard, & Hendry, 2005).  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Across the cases, the issue of time is an important factor in developing stakeholder  
51  
52 relationships. Despite research promoting enduring strategies to garner stakeholder  
53  
54 awareness and support (Jawahar & McLaughlin, 2001; Moriarty, 2012), the actuality of time  
55  
56 is not fully alluded to as a significant barrier in the majority of studies. Both Edinburgh and  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Derwent managers emphasise the importance of project working with stakeholders and  
4  
5 reinforcing relationships and trust through continual events and informal meetings. In other  
6  
7 words, managers' commitment to building relationships over time is essential. However,  
8  
9 given that the Antonine Wall is dependent on a single WHS coordinator, time is a challenge.  
10  
11

12  
13 Consequently, the Antonine Wall coordinator has limited time to develop strategies  
14  
15 and engage with stakeholders on top of their administrative duties. Again this highlights the  
16  
17 limited level of managerial capabilities in managing the Antonine Wall. In contrast to the  
18  
19 Edinburgh and Derwent sites that have a dedicated WHS team, the Antonine Wall  
20  
21 coordinator is generally restricted in their ability to effectively manage and engage with site  
22  
23 interests. To compound this support is restricted from the fellow members of the  
24  
25 management group. For example, one manager stated, *'There's a challenge of (of Local*  
26  
27 *Authority members) finding time to engage with it...this is only maybe a fifteenth, twentieth*  
28  
29 *of my work.'* Such an omission highlights the problematic nature of WHS management and  
30  
31 managerial roles.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 This finding could be grounded in the specific context of this research. For example,  
39  
40 most stakeholder theory studies focus on corporate entities, usually formal organisations  
41  
42 with contracted employees and many departments (Brower & Mahajan, 2012). This study  
43  
44 focuses on sites managed by approaches where representatives from diverse bodies meet  
45  
46 irregularly (Bell, 2013), with responsibility falling to a small site team or sole coordinator.  
47  
48 Therefore, the site specific team is vital in engaging stakeholders, something the findings  
49  
50 unearthed  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 These insights into time and resources uncover and highlight an important omission  
56  
57 from much research on stakeholder theory. Existing literature on stakeholder theory  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 predominately overlooks perspectives on time and resources, especially financial. This  
4  
5 appears surprising considering the implementation of engagement strategies to capture  
6  
7 wider interests necessities varying amounts of resources and time. However, many studies  
8  
9 within stakeholder theory are taken from organisations which are formally structured and  
10  
11 have control over staff time and have access to specific resources. However, the World  
12  
13 Heritage management situation highlights something very different. While there is an  
14  
15 administrative structure in place, management is more fluid and there are severe  
16  
17 restrictions on managers' availability and finances. Therefore, the WHS environment  
18  
19 demonstrates how challenging the effectiveness of the theory is when funds and staff time  
20  
21 is limited. Therefore, these elements should be given more credence in research.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 Conclusion

28  
29  
30 This study sought to explore how World Heritage managers administer and attempt to  
31  
32 generate stakeholder support and the extent of their success. Within WHS management the  
33  
34 inclusion and support of site stakeholders is important (Nicholas et al., 2009), however the  
35  
36 sheer size and multiple ownership patterns of some sites makes this challenging (Bell, 2013).  
37  
38 Indeed, balancing diverging concerns is demanding for managers (Garriga, 2014; Polonsky &  
39  
40 Ottman, 1998). This study explored three UK WHSs in order to provide a more in-depth  
41  
42 investigation into such managerial challenges – Edinburgh's Old and New Towns, the  
43  
44 Derwent Valley Mills, and the Antonine Wall. While each of these WHSs has a structured  
45  
46 managerial approach in place, outside this there are numerous stakeholders who can  
47  
48 influence management and the sites OUV. Across these sites, managers have highlighted the  
49  
50 significance of stakeholders external to their management approach, emphasising their  
51  
52 integral role in WHS administration (Millar, 2006; Xu & Dai, 2012).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Given the dearth of studies in this context which embrace some of the central  
4 theoretical lenses in management, and the lack of UK multiple case studies, this research  
5 has aimed to contribute to such limitations. Furthermore, given the financial climate in which  
6 heritage management is operating, stakeholder engagement and involvement has never  
7 been more significant. Overall, the importance of stakeholder engagement within WHS  
8 cannot be underestimated. As managers emphasised, the significance of engaging with  
9 differing interests, ranging from local communities, businesses and various public/private  
10 bodies is vital. Through employing strategies such as representation, raising awareness and  
11 support, managers have identified that commitment, trust and personal relationships have  
12 been built up within their stakeholder networks (Hernandez, 2008; McDonald, 2011). This  
13 has resulted in stakeholders committing time, money and resources to their WHS.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Important to this heightened level of patronage are strategies which involve  
31 participatory - rather than informative - approaches to engagement (Lask & Herold, 2004).  
32 In other words, giving stakeholders an active role in management through community led  
33 ventures or representative mechanisms which permit idea exchange and project  
34 development. For example, Edinburgh's graveyards project and the Derwent Valley's cluster  
35 groups both highlight examples of these. Significantly, these approaches allow for continual  
36 engagement, rather than ad-hoc attempts or isolated periods. Significantly, the findings of  
37 the research highlight an important factor which is largely omitted from current  
38 perspectives – the importance of 'who' is engaging the stakeholder. As the findings  
39 demonstrate, authors should not only carefully consider the strategies used to engage  
40 stakeholders, but should also place meaning on the identity of the manager or implementer.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 Across the sites the site dedicated staff (the Antonine Wall Coordinator, the Derwent WHS  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 team, and EWH) were all instrumental in managing and developing trust and personal  
4  
5 relationship with site stakeholders.  
6  
7

8  
9 However, despite some success, engagement has been challenging. This can be seen  
10  
11 in the Antonine Wall and Edinburgh cases where trust and relationships can be damaged  
12  
13 through lack of stakeholder representation and decision-making which overlooks the  
14  
15 concerns of local communities (Haddad et al., 2009). Furthermore, while the Edinburgh and  
16  
17 Derwent managers stress the success of stakeholder engagement, those at the Antonine  
18  
19 Wall are less positive. The reasoning behind this could be the limited resources and staff  
20  
21 capacity the Antonine Wall has in comparison with the other two sites. This has meant that  
22  
23 the way in which managers engage with their stakeholders differs between the sites. For  
24  
25 example, Edinburgh and Derwent have had the availability of funds to develop and execute  
26  
27 various engagement strategies, especially ones that allow for active participation. However,  
28  
29 the Antonine Wall's limited resources have created a barrier to the possibility of such  
30  
31 strategies, especially supportive measures which are vital in gaining heightened levels of  
32  
33 stakeholder participation. Secondly, the Antonine Wall is reliant on a single site coordinator,  
34  
35 limiting the intensity of possible stakeholder engagement and subsequently patronage. Both  
36  
37 the Edinburgh and Derwent sites both highlight the importance of dedicated teams in  
38  
39 planning, developing and maintaining stakeholder relationships, something the Antonine  
40  
41 Wall struggles to do.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Despite the importance of these two themes in this research, it is surprising that  
51  
52 more studies have not endeavoured to make a more pronounced connection between  
53  
54 stakeholder theory and resources and time. However, as the discussion argues, the  
55  
56 significance of themes could be grounded in the context of this study. Typically, the  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 application of stakeholder theory is used to explore corporate bodies or more formalised  
4  
5 managerial entities, instead the WHS environment offers an interesting and different  
6  
7 situation where management and engagement is both limited by more ad-hoc forms of  
8  
9 administration, manager availability and restricted funds.  
10

### 11 12 13 **Managerial implications**

14  
15 Through this study a number of managerial implications can be recognised. Firstly, given the  
16  
17 value of participatory forms of engagement in nurturing support, managers should look to  
18  
19 increase stakeholder-led projects. As The Heritage Lottery Fund (2010) argues, 'community  
20  
21 participation can involve a significant shift from providing activities for existing and potential  
22  
23 audiences to involving them in the development of activities.' The usefulness of Edinburgh's  
24  
25 graveyard projects in empowering stakeholders is testament to this. Managers could also  
26  
27 introduce training schemes which result in a 'WHS Steward' recognition for local  
28  
29 stakeholders who are involved in community-led projects. This could not only heighten the  
30  
31 importance of collective management, but reinforce the significance of World Heritage  
32  
33 through active responsibility in site administration. Such forms of engagement also offer  
34  
35 potential marketing and promotional opportunities for site managers. For example, through  
36  
37 information mechanisms, publicising such avenues could also be a crucial form of promotion  
38  
39 for the benefits of the WHS, inspiring people to become more involved and aware of their  
40  
41 surroundings. In enhancing engagement WHS managers across the UK could also create a  
42  
43 national symposium which allows site stakeholders the opportunity to show case their own  
44  
45 local heritage and success stories to others nationwide. This would not only spread the  
46  
47 potency of World heritage but also allow for best practice to be shared across sites.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Managers should also look to increase stakeholder capabilities. Given that  
4  
5 stakeholders have the ability to donate time and money this is essential. Although the  
6  
7 Derwent site uses cluster groups to enhance representation, this is lacking at Edinburgh and  
8  
9 the Antonine Wall. Therefore, stakeholder representation must be ingrained within WHS  
10  
11 management structures through mechanism where views, ideas and concerns can be  
12  
13 liberally exchanged. Given that the findings indicate that trustworthy and long-term  
14  
15 relationships have been developed between managers and site stakeholders, these must be  
16  
17 reinforced and maintained. Along with the cluster groups highlighted in the Derwent case,  
18  
19 sites could also take advantage of the internet. For example, managers could offer an e-  
20  
21 participation platform which can be used as an online forum where stakeholders could  
22  
23 exchange concerns and ask questions (Lask & Herold, 2004). Furthermore, this could be  
24  
25 used to disseminate information regarding the WHS in a more agreeable way. As such, this  
26  
27 could enable enduring communication and cooperation between policy and decision  
28  
29 makers, managers, and wider stakeholders.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 In this research, managers also stress the importance of personal relationships with  
38  
39 stakeholders and the need to maintain these. With this in mind, coupled with informational  
40  
41 engagement, managers should perhaps organise and market monthly events which bring  
42  
43 wider interests together to showcase and celebrate the accomplishments and potential of  
44  
45 World Heritage. This could reinforce existing unions and certify that engagement is constant  
46  
47 and devoted, as well as be a potential form of marketing which could be used to inspire  
48  
49 other site stakeholders to become involved in the WHS context (Garrod et al., 2011,  
50  
51 McDonald, 2011). For example, managers could use local community members and local  
52  
53 community projects to develop promotion materials which could be used on social media to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 promote the community and social benefits of involvement in WHS activities. Lastly, given  
4  
5 the importance of the dedicated team or coordinator in developing stakeholder  
6  
7 relationships, policy makers should be encouraged to ensure that sites are funded  
8  
9 appropriately. Without adequate funding and staff capacity World Heritage and its value will  
10  
11 be limited, while its aspiration of collective management and responsibility will be lost.  
12  
13

### 14 15 **Limitations and future research** 16

17  
18 This study is not without its limitations. Firstly, only WHSs in the UK were explored.  
19  
20 Therefore, due to different legislative procedures and cultural approaches to management  
21  
22 worldwide, this study may be of restricted value to nations outside the UK. Therefore,  
23  
24 future research may wish to explore cross-country compositions on how stakeholder  
25  
26 engagement and support are recognised, and the perceived challenges. Secondly, this study  
27  
28 was conducted over a 12 month period, restricting the data collection and findings to a fixed  
29  
30 period. Future research may wish to conduct a longitudinal approach, and so, unearthing  
31  
32 how engagement and relationships maintain or fade over time.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Thirdly, this study only gathered data from the perspective and experiences of  
39  
40 managers and representatives from within each WHS's management structure. Therefore,  
41  
42 different findings may be unearthed if wider stakeholder views were taken into regard. As  
43  
44 such, future studies could explore these views and contrast them to the sentiments of  
45  
46 managers. Furthermore, given that different stakeholders may have different motivational  
47  
48 factors and needs for involvement, future research may also explore the stimulus for  
49  
50 participation in site activities. A deeper understanding of these influences may uncover  
51  
52 factors which could attract disengaged interests or further reinforce existing relationships.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Given the importance of the WHS 'team' or coordinator, a future study may wish to  
4  
5 undertake observational research of the interactions between managers and wider  
6  
7 stakeholders at a given site or sites. Such a study would offer further insight into the  
8  
9 relationships and discourse between managers and stakeholders. Such research could offer  
10  
11 an opportunity to promote best practices between heritage sites in general. Furthermore,  
12  
13 future research could also embark on a joint initiative between researchers, heritage  
14  
15 managers and wider stakeholder groups. For example, the development of a local heritage  
16  
17 initiative between these interests could bridge the gap between often fractured relationship  
18  
19 between theory and practice in heritage management. With opportunities for Heritage  
20  
21 Lottery funding in the UK for community heritage projects there is the potential action-  
22  
23 research within the context.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## 30 References

- 31  
32 Aas, C., Ladkin, A., & Fletcher, J. (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage  
33 management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(1), 28-48.  
34  
35  
36 Abratt, R., & Kleyn, N. (2012). Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate  
37 reputations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(7/8), 1048-1063.  
38  
39 Anand, N., Gardner, H. K., & Morris, T. (2007). Knowledge-based innovation: emergence and  
40 embedding of new practice areas in management consulting firms. *Academy of*  
41 *Management Journal*, 50(2), 406-428.  
42  
43  
44 Anand, V., & Rosen, C. C. (2008). The ethics of organizational secrets. *Journal of*  
45 *Management Inquiry*.  
46  
47  
48 Baxter, I. (2012). *Heritage Transformed*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.  
49  
50 BBC News. (2014). Hadrian's Wall Trust axed due to 'financial constraints', *BBC News*.  
51 Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-tyne-26712711>  
52  
53  
54 Bell, V. R. (2013). The politics of managing a World Heritage Site: the complex case of  
55 Hadrian's Wall. *Leisure Studies*, 32(2), 115-132.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Bender, B., & Edmonds, M. (1992). Stonehenge: whose past? What past? *Tourism*  
4 *Management*, 13(4), 355-357.  
5  
6  
7 Bendheim, C. L., Waddock, S. A., & Graves, S. B. (1998). Determining Best Practice in  
8 Corporate-Stakeholder Relations Using Data Envelopment Analysis An Industry-Level  
9 Study. *Business & Society*, 37(3), 306-338.  
10  
11  
12 Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2003). Consumer-company identification: A framework for  
13 understanding consumers' relationships with companies. *Journal of marketing*,  
14 67(2), 76-88.  
15  
16  
17 Braganza, A., Stebbings, H., & Ngosi, T. (2013). The case of customer recruitment processes:  
18 Dynamic evolution of customer relationship management resource networks.  
19 *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(3-4), 439-466.  
20  
21  
22 Brammer, S., & Millington, A. (2004). The development of corporate charitable contributions  
23 in the UK: A stakeholder analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(8), 1411-1434.  
24  
25  
26 Bridoux, F., & Stoelhorst, J. (2013). Microfoundations for stakeholder theory: Managing  
27 stakeholders with heterogeneous motives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(1),  
28 107-125.  
29  
30  
31 Brower, J., & Mahajan, V. (2012). Driven to Be Good: A Stakeholder Theory Perspective on  
32 the Drivers of Corporate Social Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117(2), 1-19.  
33  
34  
35 Butterfield, K. D., Reed, R., & Lemak, D. J. (2004). An inductive model of collaboration from  
36 the Stakeholder's perspective. *Business & Society*, 43(2), 162-195.  
37  
38  
39 Caldwell, C., Karri, R., & Vollmar, P. (2006). Principal theory and principle theory: Ethical  
40 governance from the follower's perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(2-3), 207-  
41 223.  
42  
43  
44 Carter, S. M. (2006). The Interaction of Top Management Group, Stakeholder, and  
45 Situational Factors on Certain Corporate Reputation Management Activities. *Journal*  
46 *of Management Studies*, 43(5), 1145-1176.  
47  
48  
49 Caton, K., & Santos, C. A. (2007). Heritage tourism on Route 66: Deconstructing nostalgia.  
50 *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(4), 371-386.  
51  
52  
53 Chiabai, A., Paskaleva, K., & Lombardi, P. (2011). e-Participation Model for Sustainable  
54 Cultural Tourism Management: a Bottom-Up Approach. *International Journal of*  
55 *Tourism Research*, 15(1), 35-51.  
56  
57  
58 Crabtree, B. F., & Miller, W. L. (1999). The Dance of Interpretation. In B. F. Crabtree & W. L.  
59 Miller (Eds.), *Doing Qualitative Research* (pp. 127-144). London: Sage Publications.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 da Cruz Vareiro, L. M., Remoaldo, P. C., & Ribeiro, J. A. C. (2012). Residents' perceptions of  
4 tourism impacts in Guimarães (Portugal): a cluster analysis. *Current Issues in*  
5 *Tourism*, 16(6), 535-551.  
6  
7  
8 David, C. (2001). Mythmaking in Annual Reports. *Journal of Business and Technical*  
9 *Communication*, 15(2), 195-222.  
10  
11  
12 Davis, D., & Weiler, B. (1992). Kakadu National Park—conflicts in a world heritage area.  
13 *Tourism Management*, 13(3), 313-320.  
14  
15 De Chernatony, L. (1999). Brand management through narrowing the gap between brand  
16 identity and brand reputation. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(1-3), 157-179.  
17  
18  
19 Deephouse, D. L. (2000). Media reputation as a strategic resource: An integration of mass  
20 communication and resource-based theories. *Journal of Management*, 26(6), 1091-  
21 1112.  
22  
23  
24 Dickinson-Delaporte, S., Beverland, M., & Lindgreen, A. (2010). Building corporate  
25 reputation with stakeholders. *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(11/12), 1856-1874.  
26  
27  
28 Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts,  
29 evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65-91.  
30  
31  
32 Driessen, P. H., Kok, R. A., & Hillebrand, B. (2013). Mechanisms for stakeholder integration:  
33 Bringing virtual stakeholder dialogue into organizations. *Journal of Business*  
34 *Research*, 66(9), 1465-1472.  
35  
36  
37 Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., & Jackson, P. (2012). *Management Research*. London: Sage  
38 Publications.  
39  
40  
41 Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of*  
42 *Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.  
43  
44  
45 Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: opportunities and  
46 challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.  
47  
48  
49 Erdogan, N., & Tosun, C. (2009). Environmental performance of tourism accommodations in  
50 the protected areas: Case of Goreme Historical National Park. *International Journal*  
51 *of Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 406-414.  
52  
53  
54 Esrock, S. L., & Leichty, G. B. (2000). Organization of corporate web pages: Publics and  
55 functions. *Public Relations Review*, 26(3), 327-344.  
56  
57  
58 Evans, G. (2002). Living in a World Heritage City: stakeholders in the dialectic of the  
59 universal and particular. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 8(2), 117-135.  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Evans, G. (2004). Mundo Maya: from Cancún to city of culture. World heritage in post-  
4 colonial Mesoamerica. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(4-5), 315-329.  
5  
6 Falay, Z., Salimäki, M., Ainamo, A., & Gabrielsson, M. (2007). Design-intensive born globals:  
7 a multiple case study of marketing management. *Journal of Marketing Management*,  
8 23(9-10), 877-899.  
9  
10  
11 Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.  
12  
13 Friedman, A. L., & Miles, S. (2002). Developing stakeholder theory. *Journal of Management*  
14 *Studies*, 39(1), 1-21.  
15  
16  
17 Fry, M. L., & Polonsky, M. J. (2004). Examining the unintended consequences of marketing.  
18 *Journal of Business Research*, 57(11), 1303-1306.  
19  
20  
21 Gardberg, N., & Newburry, W. (2013). Who boycotts whom? Marginalization, company  
22 knowledge, and strategic issues. *Business & Society*, 52(2), 318–357.  
23  
24 Garriga, E. (2014). Beyond stakeholder utility function: Stakeholder capability in the value  
25 creation process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(4), 489-507.  
26  
27  
28 Garrod, B., Fyall, A., Leask, A., & Reid, E. (2011). Engaging residents as stakeholders of the  
29 visitor attraction. *Tourism Management*, 33(5), 1159-1173.  
30  
31 Godfrey, P. C. (2005). The relationship between corporate philanthropy and shareholder  
32 wealth: A risk management perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(4),  
33 777-798.  
34  
35  
36 González, R., & Medina, J. (2003). Cultural tourism and urban management in northwestern  
37 Spain: the pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela. *Tourism Geographies*, 5(4), 446-  
38 460.  
39  
40  
41 Gregory, A. (2007). Involving stakeholders in developing corporate brands: The  
42 communication dimension. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(1-2), 59-73.  
43  
44 Haddad, N., Waheeb, M., & Fakhoury, L. (2009). The Baptism archaeological site of Bethany  
45 beyond Jordan: towards an assessment for a management plan. *Tourism and*  
46 *Hospitality Planning & Development*, 6(3), 173-190.  
47  
48  
49 Haley, U. C. (1991). Corporate Contributions As Managerial Masques: Reframing Corporate  
50 Contributions As Strategies to Influence Society\*. *Journal of Management Studies*,  
51 28(5), 485-510.  
52  
53  
54 Hampton, M. P. (2005). Heritage, local communities and economic development. *Annals of*  
55 *Tourism Research*, 32(3), 735-759.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Harrison, D. (2004a). Introduction: Contested narratives in the domain of World Heritage.  
4 *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(4-5), 281-290.  
5  
6  
7 Harrison, D. (2004b). Levuka, Fiji: contested heritage. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(4-5), 346-  
8 369.  
9  
10 Harrison, D., & Hitchcock, M. (2005). *The Politics Of World Heritage: Negotiating Tourism*  
11 *And Conservation*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications, Limited.  
12  
13 Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organisational culture, identity and  
14 image. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5/6), 356-365.  
15  
16  
17 Helfen, M., & Sydow, J. (2013). Negotiating as Institutional Work: The Case of Labour  
18 Standards and International Framework Agreements. *Organization Studies*, 34(8),  
19 1073–1098.  
20  
21  
22 Herbst, F., & Coldwell, D. (2004). *Business Research*. Cape Town: Juta Academic.  
23  
24 Hernandez, M. (2008). Promoting stewardship behavior in organizations: A leadership  
25 model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(1), 121-128.  
26  
27  
28 Heugens, P. P., van den Bosch, F. A., & van Riel, C. B. (2002). Stakeholder Integration  
29 Building Mutually Enforcing Relationships. *Business & Society*, 41(1), 36-60.  
30  
31 Hitchcock, M. (2002). Zanzibar Stone Town joins the imagined community of world heritage  
32 sites. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 8(2), 153-166.  
33  
34  
35 House of Commons (2011). *Funding of the arts and heritage: Third Report of Session 2010–*  
36 *11*. The Culture, Media and Sport Committee: London  
37  
38 Husted, B. W. (1998). Organizational justice and the management of stakeholder relations.  
39 *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(6), 643-651.  
40  
41  
42 Jawahar, I., & McLaughlin, G. L. (2001). Toward a descriptive stakeholder theory: An  
43 organizational life cycle approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 397-414.  
44  
45  
46 Jia, M., & Zhang, Z. (2014). Donating Money to Get Money: The Role of Corporate  
47 Philanthropy in Stakeholder Reactions to IPOs. *Journal of Management Studies*,  
48 51(7), 1118-1152.  
49  
50 Jimura, T. (2011). The impact of world heritage site designation on local communities—A  
51 case study of Ogimachi, Shirakawa-mura, Japan. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 288-  
52 296.  
53  
54  
55 Jones, B., Temperley, J., & Lima, A. (2009). Corporate reputation in the era of Web 2.0: the  
56 case of Primark. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 25(9-10), 927-939.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Jones, T. M. (1995). Instrumental stakeholder theory: A synthesis of ethics and economics.  
4 *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 404-437.  
5  
6  
7 Keller, K. L. (2001). Mastering the Marketing Communications Mix: Micro and Macro  
8 Perspectives on Integrated Marketing Communication Programs. *Journal of*  
9 *Marketing Management*, 17(7-8), 819-847.  
10  
11 King, N. (2004a). Using Interviews in Qualitative Research. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.),  
12 *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research* (pp. 11-22).  
13 London: Sage Publications.  
14  
15  
16 King, N. (2004b). Using Templates in the Thematic Analysis of Text. In C. Cassell & G. Symon  
17 (Eds.), *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research* (pp. 256-  
18 270). London: Sage Publications.  
19  
20  
21 Lamin, A., & Zaheer, S. (2012). Wall Street vs. Main Street: Firm strategies for defending  
22 legitimacy and their impact on different stakeholders. *Organization Science*, 23(1),  
23 47-66.  
24  
25  
26 Landorf, C. (2009). Managing for sustainable tourism: a review of six cultural World Heritage  
27 Sites. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(1), 53-70.  
28  
29  
30 Lask, T., & Herold, S. (2004). An observation station for culture and tourism in Vietnam: A  
31 forum for World Heritage and public participation. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(4-5),  
32 399-411.  
33  
34  
35 Lefevre, J. C. (2007). Natural world heritage: a new approach to integrate research and  
36 management. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 13(4-5), 350-364.  
37  
38  
39 Luoma, P., & Goodstein, J. (1999). Research Notes. Stakeholders and Corporate Boards:  
40 Institutional Influences on Board Composition and Structure. *Academy of*  
41 *Management Journal*, 42(5), 553-563.  
42  
43  
44 Mattarelli, E., & Tagliaventi, M. R. (2012). How Offshore Professionals' Job Dissatisfaction  
45 Can Promote Further Offshoring: Organizational Outcomes of Job Crafting. *Journal of*  
46 *Management Studies*, 52(5), 585-620.  
47  
48  
49 McAlister, D. T., & Ferrell, L. (2002). The role of strategic philanthropy in marketing strategy.  
50 *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(5/6), 689-705.  
51  
52  
53 McDonald, H. (2011). Understanding the antecedents to public interest and engagement  
54 with heritage. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(5), 780-804.  
55  
56  
57 McVea, J. F., & Freeman, R. E. (2005). A Names-and-faces approach to stakeholder  
58 management how focusing on stakeholders as individuals can bring ethics and  
59 entrepreneurial strategy together. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(1), 57-69.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San  
4 Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 5  
6 Millar, S. (1989). Heritage management for heritage tourism. *Tourism Management*, 10(1),  
7 9-14.
- 8  
9  
10 Millar, S. (2006). Stakeholders and community participation In A. Leask & A. Fyall (Eds.),  
11 *Managing World Heritage Sites* (pp. 37-54). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- 12  
13 Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder  
14 identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts.  
15 *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853-886.
- 16  
17  
18 Moriarty, J. (2012). The connection between stakeholder theory and stakeholder  
19 democracy: An excavation and defense. *Business & Society*, 53(6), 820–852.
- 20  
21  
22 Nicholas, L. N., Thapa, B., & Ko, Y. J. (2009). Residents' Perspectives of a World Heritage Site:  
23 The Pitons Management Area, St. Lucia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 390-412.
- 24  
25  
26 O'Connell, L. L., Stephens, C. U., Betz, M., Shepard, J. M., & Hendry, J. R. (2005). An  
27 organizational field approach to corporate rationality: the role of stakeholder  
28 activism. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 15(1), 93-111.
- 29  
30  
31 Oliver, D., & Roos, J. (2007). Beyond text: Constructing organizational identity multimodally.  
32 *British Journal of Management*, 18(4), 342-358.
- 33  
34 Panneerselvam, R. (2004). *Research Methodology* New Delhi: PHI Learning.
- 35  
36 Paul, K. (2015). Stakeholder Theory, Meet Communications Theory: Media Systems  
37 Dependency and Community Infrastructure Theory, with an Application to  
38 California's Cannabis/Marijuana Industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129(3) 1-16.
- 39  
40  
41 Perez-Batres, L. A., Doh, J. P., Miller, V. V., & Pisani, M. J. (2012). Stakeholder pressures as  
42 determinants of CSR strategic choice: Why do firms choose symbolic versus  
43 substantive self-regulatory codes of conduct? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110(2), 157-  
44 172.
- 45  
46  
47 Pirson, M., & Malhotra, D. (2011). Foundations of Organizational Trust: What Matters to  
48 Different Stakeholders? *Organization Science*, 22(4), 1087-1104.
- 49  
50  
51 Polonsky, M. J., & Ottman, J. (1998). Stakeholders' contribution to the green new product  
52 development process. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 14(6), 533-557.
- 53  
54  
55 Puncheva, P. (2008). The role of corporate reputation in the stakeholder decision-making  
56 process. *Business & Society*, 47(3), 272-290.
- 57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Rasche, A. (2012). Global Policies and Local Practice. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(4), 679-  
4 708.  
5  
6 Reynolds, S. J., Schultz, F. C., & Hekman, D. R. (2006). Stakeholder theory and managerial  
7 decision-making: Constraints and implications of balancing stakeholder interests.  
8 *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64(3), 285-301.  
9  
10 Schlegelmilch, B. B., & Pollach, I. (2005). The Perils and Opportunities of Communicating  
11 Corporate Ethics. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21(3-4), 267-290.  
12  
13 Schnackenberg, A. K., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2014). Organizational Transparency A New  
14 Perspective on Managing Trust in Organization-Stakeholder Relationships. *Journal of*  
15 *Management*, 1-27.  
16  
17 Sharma, S., & Henriques, I. (2005). Stakeholder influences on sustainability practices in the  
18 Canadian forest products industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(2), 159-180.  
19  
20 Siano, A., Vollero, A., Confetto, M. G., & Siglioccolo, M. (2013). Corporate communication  
21 management: A framework based on decision-making with reference to  
22 communication resources. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 19(3), 151-167.  
23  
24 Silberberg, T. (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage  
25 sites. *Tourism Management*, 16(5), 361-365.  
26  
27 Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.  
28  
29 Smith, M., Carnegie, E., & Robertson, M. (2006). Juxtaposing the timeless and the  
30 ephemeral: staging festivals and events at World Heritage Sites In A. Leask & A. Fyall  
31 (Eds.), *Managing World Heritage Sites* (pp. 110-124). Oxford: Butterworth-  
32 Heinemann.  
33  
34 Snider, J., Hill, R. P., & Martin, D. (2003). Corporate social responsibility in the 21st century:  
35 a view from the world's most successful firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 48(2), 175-  
36 187.  
37  
38 Srivoravilai, N., Melewar, T. C., Liu, M. J., & Yannopoulou, N. (2011). Value marketing  
39 through corporate reputation: An empirical investigation of Thai hospitals. *Journal of*  
40 *Marketing Management*, 27(3-4), 243-268.  
41  
42 Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. London: Sage Publications.  
43  
44 Steyn, B. (2004). From strategy to corporate communication strategy: A conceptualisation.  
45 *Journal of Communication Management*, 8(2), 168-183.  
46  
47 Stuart, H., & Kerr, G. (1999). Marketing communication and corporate identity: are they  
48 integrated? *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 5(4), 169-179.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Su, M. M., & Wall, G. (2012). Community Participation in Tourism at a World Heritage Site:  
4 Mutianyu Great Wall, Beijing, China. *International Journal of Tourism Research*,  
5 27(7), 146-156  
6  
7  
8 Swan, J., & Scarbrough, H. (2005). The politics of networked innovation. *Human Relations*,  
9 58(7), 913-943.  
10  
11 The Heritage Lottery Fund (2015) 20 Years in 12 Places: 20 years of Lottery funding for  
12 heritage, *The Heritage Lottery Fund Online*. Retrieved 03/01/2016,  
13 file:///C:/Users/sl54/Downloads/20\_years\_in\_12\_places\_main\_report.pdf  
14  
15  
16 The Heritage Lottery Fund (2010) Thinking about...Community participation, *The Heritage*  
17 *Lottery Fund Online*. Retrieved 03/01/2016,  
18 file:///C:/Users/sl54/Downloads/thinking\_about\_community\_participation%20(1).pd  
19 f  
20  
21  
22 Ulmer, R. R., & Sellnow, T. L. (2000). Consistent questions of ambiguity in organizational  
23 crisis communication: Jack in the Box as a case study. *Journal of Business Ethics*,  
24 25(2), 143-155.  
25  
26  
27 UNESCO. (2015a). World Heritage. *UNESCO Online*. Retrieved 02/06/2015, from  
28 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>  
29  
30  
31 UNESCO. (2015b). The World Heritage Convention. *UNESCO Online*. Retrieved 15/06/2015,  
32 from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/convention/>  
33  
34  
35 van der Aa, B. J. M., Groote, P. D., & Huigen, P. P. P. (2004). World heritage as NIMBY? The  
36 case of the Dutch part of the Wadden Sea. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7(4-5), 291-302.  
37  
38  
39 Wager, J. (1995). Developing a strategy for the Angkor world heritage site. *Tourism*  
40 *Management*, 16(7), 515-523.  
41  
42  
43 Wang, H., Choi, J., & Li, J. (2008). Too little or too much? Untangling the relationship  
44 between corporate philanthropy and firm financial performance. *Organization*  
45 *Science*, 19(1), 143-159.  
46  
47  
48 Wang, H., & Qian, C. (2011). Corporate philanthropy and corporate financial performance:  
49 The roles of stakeholder response and political access. *Academy of Management*  
50 *Journal*, 54(6), 1159-1181.  
51  
52  
53 Weber, J., & Marley, K. A. (2012). In Search of Stakeholder Salience Exploring Corporate  
54 Social and Sustainability Reports. *Business & Society*, 51(4), 626-649.  
55  
56  
57 Wicks, A. C., & Harrison, J. S. (2013). Stakeholder theory, value and firm performance.  
58 *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23(1), 97-124.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Willis, K. G. (2009). Assessing visitor preferences in the management of archaeological and  
4 heritage attractions: a case study of Hadrian's Roman Wall. *International Journal of*  
5 *Tourism Research*, 11(5), 487-505.  
6  
7  
8 Xu, H., & Dai, S. (2012). A system dynamics approach to explore sustainable policies for Xidi,  
9 the world heritage village. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(5), 441-459.  
10  
11 Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). London: Sage  
12 Publications.  
13  
14 Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B., & Yuksel, A. (1999). Stakeholder interviews and tourism planning at  
15 Pamukkale, Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 20(3), 351-360.  
16  
17  
18 Yuksel, F., & Yuksel, A. (2008). Perceived Clientelism: Effects On Residents' Evaluation of  
19 Municipal Services and Their Intentions for Participation in Tourism Development  
20 Projects. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 32(2), 187-208.  
21  
22  
23 Zattoni, A. (2011). Who should control a corporation? Toward a contingency stakeholder  
24 model for allocating ownership rights. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103(2), 255-274.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60