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Public land-grant universities (PLGUs) have been mandated for nearly a century to fulfill research, teaching, and public service missions by advancing scholarly inquiry that benefits broader society, by ensuring educational access to a broad citizenry, and by providing direct assistance to communities primarily through agricultural cooperative extension services. With the advent of a global service-based economy in recent decades, PLGUs have become involved with tourism planning and development efforts in their communities as forms of education and public service through academic programs and cooperative extension tourism, as well as through conference and event services and through campus-based visitor information centers. PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development signals a trend towards placemaking that coincides with the national university-community engagement movement.

This exploratory analysis begins to clarify PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development as an emergent form of university-community engagement. The study finds that predominantly elite PLGUs are promoting their involvement with tourism planning and development as community engagement, thereby advancing themselves as powerful placemakers that help to make their communities more competitive destinations in regional and national place hierarchies. As a consequence, PLGUs that appear to lack capacity to compete in this innovative approach to community
engagement also appear to lack placemaking power in their communities. Ultimately, the study asserts that the adoption of community-based tourism engagement marketing strategies among elite PLGUs creates a new playing field on which lower capacity PLGUs and their communities are disadvantaged to compete. Ironically, this practice reinforces the very class and power structures that the university-community engagement movement seeks to address.

Using primarily grounded theory, institutional ethnography, and case study methodological approaches, the study identifies and characterizes levels of tourism planning and development capacity among PLGUs on national and regional scales. The study lays groundwork for further research on PLGU tourism planning and development as both a potentially beneficial and potentially disempowering form of university-community engagement.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Although universities traditionally are not considered to be stakeholders or partners in tourism, let alone contributors to tourism planning and development processes (Getz, Andersson, and Larson 2007), universities in the U.S. – particularly public land-grant universities (PLGUs) – increasingly are investing in, and involved with, tourism planning and development activities. Tourism planning scholars acknowledge roles of festivals and events in constructing destination image (e.g., “hallmark events” like the Olympics and the World’s Fair; community festivals; professional conferences) (Getz, 2007; Hall, 1989; Holcomb, 1999; Costa and Martinotti, 2003). They also legitimize roles of visitor information centers in fostering visitor satisfaction by providing historic, geographic, and cultural highlights that characterize destination areas and directing tourists to attractions, facilities, and services (Buhalis 2000; Inskeep, 1991). Roles of university faculty in tourism planning and development through teaching and training tourism and hospitality professionals, along with land use, transportation, and business development consulting, also have been mentioned in the literature (Gunn 2002).

Based on these categories, PLGUs and other higher education institutions in the U.S., arguably, are involved with tourism planning and development activities in a variety of ways. Tourism planning scholar Clare Gunn suggests that the demand-side of tourism substantiates such involvement, as “[u]niversities, colleges, technical institutions, and research centers are of interest to many travelers but require special access, exhibits, and tour guidance for tourism” (2002, p. 65). PLGUs – either intentionally or not – are supplying attractions and events that address tourist development demands. These include campus-based sites and meeting spaces (e.g., museums, botanical gardens, art galleries,
cultural institutes), as well as academic, sports, and cultural events (e.g., conferences, commencements, homecoming celebrations, football and basketball tournaments, cultural festivals, concerts) that attract an array of visitors including students’ family members, alumni, funders, residents, and out-of-towners who stay for a day or spend a long weekend. Some campuses offer information centers that direct these visitors to campus- and community-based attractions by distributing collateral material and offering tours. Even further, some campus-based visitor information centers partner with local destination management organizations – perhaps better recognized locally as convention and visitor bureaus (CVBs) – to cross-promote campus-based and local attractions to tourists (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. The University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Visitor & Information Programs webpage promotes “campus attractions.” Note external links to Greater Madison CVB and State of Wisconsin tourism websites. Retrieved from http://www.vip.wisc.edu/attractions.html, accessed June 1, 2011.
Gunn also acknowledges universities as tourism planners with regard to faculty consulting and educational services. Gunn cites that

[a]s universities have expanded their curricula to include tourism, many researchers and teachers are frequently engaged in tourism planning consulting. . . . Their main contribution is the latest technical or scientific information, important for many tourism planning projects. Many universities are engaged in adult and extension educational programs directed toward tourism that include planning. They work in the field holding seminars, meetings, creating publications, and providing demonstrations. (ibid., p. 14)

Indeed, several PLGUs are involved with cooperative extension tourism programs that provide tourism planning assistance to surrounding municipalities and regions by educating local farmers and other business owners about agritourism and cultural tourism through cooperative extension workshops; by raising awareness of local cultural heritage
among residents and visitors alike through community tours; and by developing local leadership capacity for festival event tourism as a community/regional economic and cultural development strategy (see Figure 2).

What is less clear, however, is the extent to which PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development activities advances or detracts from their tripartite mission of public service, research, and teaching. In an era of mounting scrutiny regarding the value of higher education to broader society, PLGUs and other major research universities are being called upon increasingly to be more accountable to public stakeholders that have sustained them for well over a century through taxes and tuition. Weerts observes that

[there] are internal struggles to reclaim the soul of American higher education. Once viewed as the answer to poverty, racism, and other social ills, higher education today is often viewed as wasteful and overpriced and failing to deliver on its promises. As a result, higher education is increasingly viewed as a private consumer good than as a public good. (2007, p. 80)

Community engagement is one strategy that some PLGUs and other higher education institutions are implementing to help demonstrate public value and to stem the perception that they are disconnected from community interests and concerns. University-community engagement has become a national – if not international movement (see, for example, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2007; Brulin, 2002; Winter, Wiseman, & Muirhead, 2006)– that seeks to advance a renewed perspective on research universities as local anchor institutions and global knowledge economy leaders working collaboratively to improve the quality of life prospects of municipalities and regions near and far (Castells, 2000; Taylor, 2010; The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2008). The engagement movement advocates a departure from traditional, one-way outreach approaches to public service like PLGU cooperative
extension and early forms of service learning that cast universities as objective, expert knowledge producers developing and interpreting solutions for communities that are served as end users (Ang, 2006; Crabtree, 1998; McDowell, 2001). By contrast, universities genuinely operating within the engagement paradigm are expected to integrate their research, teaching, and public service resources and to use them to work with community entities as respected, reciprocal stakeholders and co-learners towards addressing mutual issues and opportunities.

University public service scholars maintain that an engagement mode of university involvement with tourism planning and development is more likely to help demonstrate the value of PLGUs to the public good than an outreach mode (Sandmann 2008; Weerts 2007). Is PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development a viable way for PLGUs to advance a community engagement agenda? If so, in light of mounting public scrutiny regarding universities’ contributions to society, why would PLGUs opt to administer public service through tourism planning and development instead of what perhaps may be understood as more mission-oriented, more obvious, and more pressing regional and community development concerns such as agriculture, small business development and entrepreneurship, public health and nutrition, and access to information technology? Does a PLGU’s intentional and even unintentional involvement with tourism planning and development create certain benefits and/or risks for the institution and the communities it is mandated to serve? Is it really more about promoting institutional interests than it is about working with communities? To begin to answer these kinds of questions, we first must establish which universities actually may be involved with tourism planning and development, as well as examine what their involvement entails. This study sets out to accomplish the task of surveying PLGU
tourism planning and development nationally, thereby setting a foundation for critical inquiry regarding the phenomenon.

**Calling the question: Does tourism planning and development advance PLGUs’ “third mission”?**

Marketing is considered to be a critical aspect of tourism planning development because it helps to create and reinforce positive images of a destination that can attract visitors (Holcomb, 1999). Through this study, I observe and document an emerging trend among certain PLGUs and other universities: the use of tourism planning and development mechanisms – i.e., campus visitor information centers, conference and event services, and cooperative extension tourism – as place marketing tools towards advancing an image of community engagement. I am concerned, however, that PLGUs and other universities that either are unaware of this trend or that do not have the knowledge, infrastructure, or resources to participate in it potentially are being disempowered as placemakers and, ultimately, as public service partners and resources in their communities. Ironically, through this process, community engagement becomes a perception-based, insider-outsider organizing principle that reinforces the very class and power structures that it aims to address.

Connell, whose research links universities with tourism, aptly observes that, “At first glance, the terms ‘tourism’ and ‘university’ may sit rather uncomfortably together” (2000, p. 1). What may be particularly uncomfortable about PLGU tourism planning and development is that while it is being framed as community engagement, it also reflects another, perhaps more controversial trend: the intensifying commercialization of higher education. Bok (2003) claims that commercial activity (i.e., revenue generation) in higher
education is not new but rather has become “unprecedented [in] size and scope” during the 21st century due to a number of late 20th century economic and social conditions including federal and state budget cuts to higher education, the proliferation of a national culture supporting corporate enterprise development, and the subsequent rise of a high-tech knowledge economy that has enticed universities and their academic experts to manufacture and sell research to the highest corporate bidder. Bok observes that this trend is tied to community engagement in the sense that

[n]ew opportunities for earning money have clearly helped make universities more attentive to public needs. . . . students of higher education have credited market forces with causing universities to become less stodgy and elitist and more vigorous in their efforts to aid economic growth. Many people doubtless applaud this result and feel that universities are doing more to justify the large sums of public money governments spend on their behalf. (pp. 15-16)

While I agree with Bok that universities have become more attuned to public service in recent years, I do not agree that the community engagement trend has somehow made them less elitist, particularly with regard to commercialized activity like tourism planning and development. As this analysis demonstrates, PLGUs that are framing their involvement with tourism planning and development as public service and/or community engagement actually are considered to be among the most elite institutions in the U.S., if not the world. As powerful placemakers in their communities and regions, these elite institutions have created a new (or yet another) playing field on which PLGUs of lesser stature are less equipped to participate. As a result, lower capacity PLGUs and their communities and regions appear to be competitively disadvantaged in the new higher education placemaking paradigm.

This study is the product of a ground-level, exploratory inquiry into PLGU tourism planning and development. Through this research, I ascertain that PLGUs are
involved in tourism planning and development primarily through mechanisms suggested
by Gunn (2002) which include: (1) campus-based visitor information centers; (2)
university conference and event services; (3) cooperative extension tourism (i.e., faculty
consulting and educational services); and (4) academic programs in tourism and allied
fields (e.g., leisure studies, hospitality and hotel management, recreation). Each of these
mechanisms has the potential to address one or more tourism planning and development
goals identified by Gunn: (1) “enhanced visitor satisfactions,” primarily through high
quality, well-coordinated accommodation, information, and transportation services; (2)
“improved economy and business success” through solid tourism feasibility research, as
well as research-based policy formulation that encourages collaboration between
governmental agencies and private developers; (3) “sustainable resource use” through
eco-friendly facility development and green marketing approaches driven by genuine
concern for the environment rather than solely generating niche market activity; and (4)
“community and area integration” through public planning facilitation, local education,
and cooperative marketing among stakeholders (pp. 15-22). Herein, I demonstrate that
these mechanisms are tied to the growing university-community engagement movement
in that they are being promoted as outward demonstrations of PLGUs’ active fulfillment
of a refurbished social contract in the current era of accountability in higher education.

Aside from Connell’s works, tourism planning literature is limited regarding the
extent to which PLGU mechanisms of tourism planning and development are used to
advance public service – the “third mission,” as Roper and Hirth (2005) have it – or even
to fulfill PLGU research and teaching obligations. Thus, in addition to laying groundwork
for specific research on PLGU tourism planning and development, this study aims to
expand inquiry initiated by Connell that links universities and tourism activity in general, however uncomfortable the idea may seem.

Tourism planning and development capacity and placemaking: Key observations, arguments, and assumptions.

Among certain PLGUs, campus visitor information centers, conference and event services, and cooperative extension tourism are being promoted as forms of public service. By employing community engagement-oriented images and language, these tourism planning and development mechanisms appear to be transcending what may be considered traditional university-centered functions. Through primarily web-based marketing, the mechanisms are being reimaged as symbolic spaces for community trust building, for information exchanges that develop social capital, and for promoting mutual, place-based interests between PLGUs and the populations that they are mandated to serve.

Herein, instead of campus visitor information centers being depicted strictly as functionaries of undergraduate admissions, they are being framed more broadly as information service hubs that promote on-campus, local, and regional visitor attractions, as well as spaces for convening campus and community groups. Likewise, the roles of conference and event service departments and facilities appear to be expanding beyond traditional space reservation, catering, and lodging functions to encompass client relationship-oriented partnership development in an effort to connect faculty, staff, and students with external entities in academic, corporate, government, and community-based nonprofit sectors. Cooperative extension tourism – which may be fortified substantially by academic program expertise in tourism, recreation, hospitality, and leisure studies – is
being repackaged as well, shedding an outmoded one-way, tourism planning expert knowledge transfer approach in favor of a participatory, interactive, and client-centered resource portal model that provides local business owners – from farmers to tech entrepreneurs – an array of value-added opportunities in agritourism, festival event management, and nature tourism.

This study views PLGUs with all of these mechanisms as having high levels of tourism planning and development capacity. The tourism planning and development concept, as used in this study, is derived from two fields: (1) community-based tourism planning and (2) community development. From a tourism planning perspective, Moscardo (2008) defines such capacity in a collective sense. Capacity is understood as an entire community’s readiness to participate in tourism development based on strong “local tourism leadership, effective planning and coordination and involvement of local stakeholders.” Moscardo’s analysis of nearly 400 tourism development case studies finds that a community’s level of tourism planning and development capacity is determined by its level of collective tourism knowledge, as well as strong “networks and relationships” and high “levels of trust and cohesiveness” (i.e., social capital) among community members (pp. 9-10).

Community development scholars Glickman and Servon (1998) define capacity in terms of organizations (i.e., community development corporations). Their seminal study identifies several forms of community-based organizational capacity, two of which are particularly relevant here: programming capacity and networking capacity. Programming capacity is understood as an institution’s ability to provide tourism planning and development services that fulfill its education, research, and public service mission (e.g., offering technical assistance to small businesses; planning and/or hosting cultural events
and educational conferences). Networking capacity is understood as an institution’s ability to build and manage relationships with external entities (e.g., municipal- and county-level CVBs, state tourism departments, national tourism-oriented professional organizations) that may provide additional support with fulfilling its mission more effectively.

By dovetailing Moscardo’s community-based tourism capacity with Glickman and Servon’s organizational capacity concepts, this study offers a way to capture PLGU tourism planning and development as a community anchor institution phenomenon (The Netter Center for Community Partnerships, 2008). As such, the phenomenon is assumed to involve reciprocal exchanges between PLGUs and local communities, as well as reciprocal professional exchanges within and among PLGUs. Herein, PLGUs that feature and promote multiple tourism planning and development mechanisms as community engagement are exercising both organizational capacity and community-based capacity. These PLGUs articulate with other PLGUs within their ranks, thus codifying organizational prestige and power structures that define not only the institutions but also the geographic places surrounding them as distinct, and desireable, destinations. These PLGUs also potentially add value to a community’s overall tourism planning and development capacity, as they promulgate tourism knowledge through cooperative extension and academic programs, as well as provide services and spaces that support establishing and strengthening community social capital networks. Thus, through their community engagement marketing efforts, PLGUs with high tourism planning and development capacity appear to be in a position to maximize potential socioeconomic benefits of tourism for themselves and for their communities. Conversely, PLGUs with
low tourism planning and development capacity appear to be in a less advantageous position to do so.

In addition to programming and networking capacity, placemaking is a key concept underlying PLGU tourism planning and development, as certain PLGUs appear to be inculcating its principles in their public service activities and missions. Placemaking is considered a holistic approach to planning and development that emphasizes capacity building among community residents and encompasses a rather broad range of thematic concepts and goals. These include promoting sense of place or place quality; local involvement and participation; integration of natural, built, and cultural environments; and the adoption of planning and development approaches that are supposed to sustain these integrated environments (Nelson, Butler, and Wall, 1999; Schneekloth and Shibley, 1995).

Several urban scholars argue that place competitiveness, place quality, and place attachment are critical now more than ever before as economic well-being, quality of life, and personal and group identities have become enmeshed. In the global network society, the fortunes (and misfortunes) of individuals, organizations, cities, and regions have become tied to the types of places that they are perceived as coming from, currently occupying, and/or moving towards (Bonner 2002; Castells 2000; Corcoran 2002; Drier, Mollenkopf, and Swanstrom 2005; Florida 2002). Thus, professions and institutions whose decisions have expert-level influence over placemaking processes – including planning, public policy, historic preservation, architecture, facility management, interior design, engineering, and now, universities – are viewed as having increasingly significant power in determining how places are perceived by residents and visitors, as well as where
As certain PLGUs and other select universities have assumed greater roles in placemaking, I observe that the emerging university-community engagement-oriented marketing trend has two primary effects. First, it creates a level of innovation that distinguishes PLGUs that are more involved with tourism planning and development from those that are less involved. I argue that this level of innovation accords higher capacity institutions with expert placemaking status while lower capacity institutions appear to lack placemaking power. While the community engagement marketing trend may serve to illuminate the public service value of certain PLGUs in a fresh way to their communities and to broader society, my analysis suggests a second effect that perhaps is a bit more subtle: the trend also accentuates prestige disparities among PLGUs on a national scale. Ironically, despite the egalitarian vision of the community engagement movement, the adoption of community engagement marketing strategies among PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacity underscores PLGU prestige hierarchies. As institutions that are mandated to serve their states, their tourism planning and development capacity levels have implications for the places where they are located. This is problematic for lower capacity PLGUs and the communities that they serve, as they actually may benefit from tourism planning and development due to limited community and regional development opportunities in their areas. On the other hand, if tourism is not a viable opportunity, lower capacity PLGUs and their communities may be adversely affected by tourism planning and development efforts, as they lack the capacity to engage and advocate on behalf of locals in planning processes (Moscardo, 1998).
Research questions.

The following primary research questions have guided this study towards addressing the central research question posed above: **Is PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development a form of community engagement?**

**Research question 1: How are PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacities distinguished from PLGUs with lower capacities?**

*Guiding hypothesis: PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacities tend to use place-based, community engagement-oriented images and language in their marketing, which is creating a level of innovation that relegates PLGUs with lower tourism planning and development capacities to a perceived state of lower placemaking status.*

The study places university involvement with tourism planning and development in perspective by presenting a national inventory that documents which PLGUs have certain tourism planning and development mechanisms and which ones do not, as well as the types of tourism activities that they may or may not promote, among other functions. Some examples of comparable non-land-grant university-community tourism planning and development – representing members of the AAU, an invitation-only nonprofit association established in 1900 that is comprised of 61 leading North American public and private research universities – are included as well to enrich institutional comparisons and to provide a more comprehensive national picture of the phenomenon.

This analysis helps to concretize what I term PLGU tourism planning and development capacity by documenting programmatic and networking forms of
This is a necessary step in order to begin to address more critical concerns regarding how PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development is a tool for advancing placemaking as part of institutional missions; understanding the benefits and drawbacks of the phenomenon on PLGUs and surrounding communities; and, ultimately, determining the extent to which PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development actually is a form of community engagement.

Research question 2: How is PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development justified as a mission-driven activity?

Guiding hypothesis: PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development is marketed by PLGUs as a mission-driven form of public service that emphasizes three placemaking-oriented tourism approaches: cultural heritage tourism, ecotourism, and rural tourism.

Cultural heritage tourism, ecotourism (or nature-based tourism), and rural tourism are cited as three common components of sustainable or community-based tourism planning (Edgell, 2006). Sustainable tourism planning and placemaking share a principle-based theme of working towards achieving balance among the environment, the economy, and people (Beatley and Manning, 1997; Healey, 1999). Chapter 3 of the study provides a national overview of university-community tourism planning and development. I illustrate how PLGUs – as a matter of public service mission fulfillment and as a means to demonstrate commitment to community engagement – link cooperative

---

1 For further details on the analysis process, see the “Methodology of the study - Macro- and micro-level data: National inventory and semiotics” section of this study, p. 24.
extension tourism efforts, conference and event services, and campus-based visitor information centers with what generally are viewed as sustainable tourism approaches. Despite ongoing debate in the academic literature, cultural heritage tourism, ecotourism, and rural tourism are recognized as relatively environmentally and culturally sustainable forms of tourism (Nelson, et al., 1999).

**Research question 3: What are reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development? Do benefits and drawbacks differ based on institutional capacity levels?**

*Guiding hypothesis: Reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development are rooted in concepts of placemaking which include community collaboration or community power conflict; enhanced or inhibited place competitiveness; and positive or negative destination image formation. Because higher capacity level PLGUs are more involved in placemaking efforts in their communities, they are more likely to experience reciprocal benefits and drawbacks than PLGUs at lower capacity levels.*

Two regional university-community tourism planning and development case studies are explored in chapter 4. Based on the analysis phases described in chapter 3, it is assumed that PLGUs categorized at Level III and Level IV capacities are more likely to share potential gains and losses with their stakeholder communities. The subject of the first case study is Rutgers University, a Level III capacity institution located in New Jersey’s Gateway Tourism Region. The region encompasses the institution’s widely recognized flagship campus in New Brunswick – the historic “birthplace of Rutgers” –
and its smaller yet “cosmopolitan” Newark campus. In keeping with the central question of the study, insights (e.g., documents; responses from interviewees) regarding how this activity is used as a mechanism for advancing a mission-driven, engagement perception are highlighted.

While it is assumed that mutual benefits and drawbacks apply most to PLGUs operating within Level IV, Level III, and even possibly Level II tourism capacity categories, the opposite is assumed of Level I PLGUs. Such is the case with Alcorn State University, an historically black PLGU that is one of three universities legislatively named as partners in the recently designated Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area (MDNHA). The other universities are Delta State University, an historically white state university, and Mississippi Valley State University, an historically black state university.

**Research impact**

There are at least three significant problem or opportunity areas that this research project aims to address.

1) **Improving local and regional economic competitiveness.**

The ability of communities and regions to implement and institutionalize partnership efforts has been linked to political equality, healthy civic life and participation, and strong social capital networks of mutual trust. It has been argued that cities and regions that lack these characteristics tend to create top-down, authoritarian, and exclusionary institutional structures and cultures that can impede community and regional economic performance (Florida 2003; Putnam 1993). Following this logic,

---

research that examines opportunities and pitfalls of community engagement among tourism planning and development stakeholders (e.g., PLGU cooperative extension departments, campus-based visitor information centers, CVBs and chambers of commerce) ultimately could help to inform local and regional competitiveness and placemaking efforts. Indeed, the implementation and institutionalization of regional tourism partnerships has been judged to be a weakness in tourism development and management and, therefore, worthy of increased research emphasis (Jamal and Stronza, 2009). This is one rationale underlying the selection of two region-based case studies for this research project. Examining the roles of Rutgers University in New Jersey’s Gateway Tourism Region and Alcorn State University in the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area region provides insights regarding PLGU tourism planning and development in territorial contexts, particularly as regional industrial clustering has become a salient strategy within economic development policy (Porter, 2000).

2) **Demonstrating the public value of research universities while broadening the scope of university-community partnership and engagement research and activity.**

Within the urban planning field, university-community partnerships are viewed as a viable means to achieve local and regional development through education and training (McKoy and Vincent, 2007; Santo, Ferguson, and Trippel, 2010), technology and innovation (Florida and Cohen, 1999; Hall, Link, and Scott, 2001), housing, real estate and business development (Perry and Wiewel, 2005; Rodin 2007), and urban design (Loveridge, 2002). Tourism planning and development, however, is a lens that has not been explored in planning’s university-community partnership and engagement literature. Yet, as previous examples suggest, PLGUs are partners and stakeholders in tourism
planning and development efforts. Moreover, their involvement appears to be becoming more integral to community placemaking processes. Their roles and contributions warrant further analysis, especially as PLGUs are being pressured to demonstrate how they contribute to the public good (Commission on the Future of Higher Education 2006).

The study brings attention to this phenomenon as yet another means by which universities are attempting to fulfill their public service missions by claiming to enhance civic livelihood and overall quality of life in communities and regions. Again, the literature review provides additional insights regarding how engagement and placemaking are linked to community and regional development.

3) Developing tourism planning scholarship within the planning discipline.

Despite steady scholarly attention and research development over the last quarter of the 20th century, tourism planning and development continues to be considered a field of inter- and multi-disciplinary academic inquiry rather than a codified academic sub-discipline in and of itself (Tribe, 2010). Specifically within planning practice, tourism has been viewed at best as “tangential to other planning functions” and, at worst, as “invisible to many planners.” In the early 2000s, tourism planning scholarship was considered “scarce” (Harrill and Potts, 2003, p. 233) and as having yet to measure up to earlier predictions that it would be one of planning education’s “emerging specializations” (Inskeep, 1988, p. 360).

Since that time, academic planning journals have published articles on tourism-related topics, albeit not at the level that one may expect based on such predictions. Recognizing that “[p]lanning has become a central player in the study of the link between the arts and economic development,” in March 2010, the Journal of Planning Education and Research produced a special issue entitled “Art, Culture, and Economic
Development: New Directions for the Growth of Cities and Regions.” The special issue aimed to “bring critical discussions on the relationship between the arts and development to the forefront of the economic development literature” (Currid, 2010, p. 257). Tourism is acknowledged throughout the publication as an important economic development strategy; yet, tourism planning concepts and terminology shared across other disciplines such as community and regional development, geography, and parks and recreation are not as well integrated or referenced. Thus, tourism planning and development remains an open, “post-disciplinary” field of study that is relatively free of “disciplinary policing,” (Tribe 2010, p. 10) which presents researchers with a host of theoretical and methodological liberties as well as complexities. This study seeks to contribute to the development of community-engaged tourism planning scholarship.

With regard to academic tourism programs and allied fields of study such as hospitality, hotel management, and leisure studies, it is assumed that such programs, by and large, are intended to develop future managers and leaders within the diverse professions of the tourism industry. There has been recent debate within the tourism education literature, however, regarding the usefulness of such training beyond professionalization. Scholars observe that if tourism education is preparing professionals to advance sustainable, community-based approaches to tourism development, curricula should foster critical thinking acumen in addition to management skills by incorporating sociological perspectives on tourism. Indeed, tourism and allied fields are perceived among some scholars as more vocational than academic (Aitchison, 2001; Edensor, 2000). Efforts to apply social science theories and inquiry to tourism activity are part of a broader project to elevate tourism studies (depending on one’s perspective) as a critical, academic discipline (see, for example, Costa and Martinotti, 2003; Fainstein, Hoffmann,
Methodology of the study

A primary goal of this research project is to contribute to the development of tourism planning theory within the planning discipline as well as the tourism planning and higher education fields. More specifically, this research project aims to explore university-community tourism planning and development as an emerging line of research.

Similar to Leonard and McAdam (2000), the study encompasses a three-phase interpretive research design. Interpretive studies aim for contextual understanding, gaining insights about theoretical issues from iterative comparisons between specific cases and broader contexts, as well as from language (Allan, 1998; Greene, 1990; Yin, 1994). As such, interpretive researchers generally rely on qualitative methods (Patton, 1990; Ragin, 1994). Relatively little is understood about the roles of PLGUs (and other research universities) with tourism planning and development. Establishing theoretical foundations was a necessary first step in order to critically frame general (i.e., national-level) and in-depth (i.e., local-level) observations of the university-community tourism planning and development phenomenon, as well as to identify and develop opportunities for further research in this area.

Three qualitative research frameworks inform the design of this research project: grounded theory, institutional ethnography, and case study methodology. Table 1 provides an overview followed by a more detailed description of the research design.
**Grounded theory framework.**

Grounded theory emerged as an appropriate methodological framework for performing and understanding this research project, because it provides a way of generating new theory grounded in [a] field but also set in the context of existing theory. . . . Researchers start with a topic of interest, collect data and allow relevant ideas to develop. . . . Data are gathered usually through field observation and/or interviews, but numerical data may also be included. Initially, the approach taken is inductive and consequently hypotheses and tentative theories emerge from the data set. In this way, an inductive–deductive interplay is established. Ideas inductively derived from the data form mini-theories, which are then either confirmed or refuted by subsequent theoretically sampled data. (McGhee, Marland, and Atkinson, 2007, p. 335)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Overview of research design for the PLGU tourism planning and development study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research phases or components</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Literature review (Chapter 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Chapter 3 national overview and assessment (macro-level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Chapter 4 case studies (micro-level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a theory building exercise on a little known phenomenon, this research project has emerged from an exploratory process that has been inductive, non-linear, iterative, and open to revision (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998) towards establishing university-community tourism planning and development as an emerging line of research. The research project represents several years of operating among various interpretive research modes including observation, conversation, material analysis, and reflection on language.

I am aware that conventional social scientific research and writing generally begins with a review of existing literature that helps to locate researchers’ hypotheses and/or theoretical propositions within an established framework. This suggests a deductive research design, as hypotheses, propositions, and variables are assumed to have been identified in advance (Yin, 1994). Indeed, this design is said to give “assessors and reviewers of research . . . an ontology (a classification of what is data) and an epistemology (a philosophy of research)” as ways to situate and classify a research study and to determine its merits and shortcomings (Walls, Parahoo, and Fleming, 2010, p. 10). A deductive reporting structure would not do the present research justice, however, as research and writing processes have been iterative and non-predictive.

**Literature review as data.**

The literature review for this research project departs somewhat from deductive reviews that attempt to identify theoretical gaps. The literature review may be understood more accurately as an effort to identify and connect common themes across otherwise disparate texts, as it attempts to synthesize existing, overlapping paradigms and concepts among three bodies of literature: (1) planning; (2) tourism planning; and (3) higher
education public service. Indeed, there is some debate within the grounded theory literature as to the function of a literature review. A founder of grounded theory, Strauss (1987) sees the literature review as a way to sensitize the researcher to issues regarding his topic of interest. Conversely, Glaser (1998) warns that reading within one’s substantive area and other relevant literature can impede discovery and emergence of themes, which are key aspects of grounded theory analysis. Heath (2006) advises that despite this debate, grounded theorists generally agree “that once the theory begins to emerge, existing literature will be used as data” (p. 521).

Based on my experience performing this study, I agree with Strauss and Heath: treating the literature review as data before and during the research process helped to sensitize me to issues and patterns that I came across while gathering and analyzing data from other sources. Thus, based on cross-disciplinary readings as well as observations of and experience with the phenomenon, the three bodies of literature emerged as a collective theoretical space for beginning to understand the university-community tourism planning and development phenomenon. Research questions and guiding hypotheses were developed and refined through an iterative process of gathering and analyzing data from readings, conversations (e.g., interviews), and observations.

**Macro- and micro-level data: National inventory and semiotics.**

The national PLGU tourism planning and development inventory presented in chapter 3 represents efforts to confirm, refute, and/or refine guiding hypotheses developed through the literature review process.

For the national PLGU tourism planning and development inventory, I created a database as a way to document characteristics of PLGU and private and public non-land-
grant university websites. Semiotics underlies this approach. Semiotics is a method of
deconstructing language and images as texts. Specifically, semiotic analysis has been
used in tourism research as a method of critical discourse analysis to illuminate how such
texts can be “tremendously powerful in representing and reconstituting areas of social
life,” regardless of how “‘ideologically innocent’ they may appear” (Thurlow and
Jaworski, 2003, p. 581). More specifically, tourism scholars have employed semiotics to
demonstrate how corporate branding and communication strategies in the travel industry
are designed to yield economic capital through the creation and exploitation of symbolic
and cultural capital based on primarily Western service-based economies that are driven
by symbolism, imagery and design-intensity (Bourdieu, 1991; Thurlow and Jaworski,
2006). From this perspective,

there is little apparent materiality to the ‘products’ being sold; instead, what is the
exchange of capital hinges on the promotion of ideas, images and lifestyles.
Furthermore, what materiality there is, is typically given substance and meaning
by the narratives or discourses that frame it. . . . travel is in fact one of the best
examples of an industry which is deeply semiotically embedded, since a key part
of what is actually consumed is the semiotic context of the service and the
imagery of tourist destinations pre-figured in brochures, guidebooks, holiday
travel programmes and so on. (Thurlow and Aiello, 2007, p. 309-310)

For the purposes of this study, I include PLGU tourism planning and development
websites in this list of travel-related documents. Throughout the national inventory
section, I provide brief semiotic critiques of PLGU tourism planning and development
websites to highlight power dynamics that underlie this new form of community-engaged
placemaking through visual and textual representation.

Towards addressing the first research question and guiding hypothesis, I
documented and determined levels of tourism planning and development capacity among
PLGUs and other comparable institutions based on whether or not they have a conference
and event services unit; a campus-based visitor information center; and/or a cooperative extension tourism program or similar resources (e.g., faculty, web-based materials). Academic programs in tourism and allied fields (e.g., hospitality, leisure studies) also were documented in the analysis as an additional way to capture faculty expertise as part of assessing institutional capacity. I reviewed and analyzed well over 150 university websites for cooperative extension, conference and event services, and campus visitor information centers to gather this information. Google search engine was used to confirm the presence of hotels, museums, and golf facilities at 108 universities (69 PLGUs and 39 private and public non-land-grant institutions). I also conducted survey phone interviews with departmental representatives at each institution where possible to confirm data gathered from their websites, as well as to gather additional insights regarding departmental roles with tourism.

Towards addressing the second research question and guiding hypothesis, I analyzed images and/or language used to connect PLGU tourism planning and development mechanisms with what may be considered placemaking-oriented, sustainable forms of tourism development, i.e., cultural heritage tourism, ecotourism, and rural tourism. PLGU and private and public non-land-grant university websites also were analyzed for indicators of local and national relationships with tourism entities related to the tourism planning and development mechanisms. These tourism planning and development programming and networking capacity enhancements, as I call them, include documented relationships with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entities (e.g., CVBs, chambers of commerce, state tourism offices, National Park Service), which were confirmed (or refuted) through survey phone interviews. Current affiliations with four specific research, professional, and event marketing organizations
also were documented: (1) the National Extension Tourism Design Team (as indicated by institutional representation on the Team or at the 2011 conference); (2) membership with the Collegiate Information and Visitor Services Association (CIVSA); (3) membership with the Association of Collegiate Conference and Events Directors-International (ACCED-I); and (4) membership with Unique Venues, an online conference and event venue marketing organization with over 350 member colleges and universities throughout in the United States, the UK, and Canada (see Figure 3).

Finally, as a means of assessing institutional commitment to community engagement, two primary indicators were documented as part of the analysis. I documented institutions that are annual dues paying members of Campus Compact, billed as “the only national higher education association dedicated solely to campus-based civic engagement” (Campus Compact, 2011). Also, institutions that have elected to be assessed and successfully named to the 2010 Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement were documented.3 Campus Compact and Carnegie Foundation websites as well as survey phone interviews were used to gather and verify this data.

**Case study and institutional ethnography frameworks.**

In order to achieve a deeper understanding of university-community tourism planning and development – in particular, its benefits and drawbacks as indicated in the third research question and guiding hypothesis – a case study framework is appropriate because the research: (1) is addressing exploratory research questions towards establishing grounds for further inquiry; (2) is investigating a phenomenon within real-life contexts; and (3) has required flexibility to follow changing circumstances that
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generally characterize real-life circumstances; and (4) is the product of data collection from multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 1994).

Figure 3. A collection of advertisement links from Unique Venues’ college and universities information webpage. Unique Venues is described as a “marketing and membership organization committed to bringing together one-of-a-kind event venues with meeting planners who are ready for something new.” Founded over 25 years ago by a graduate of the William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Unique Venues markets conference, meeting, and event spaces for over 300 colleges and universities in the United States, Canada, and the UK. See http://www.uniquevenues.com/colleges-universities and “one step ahead” at http://www.uniquevenues.com/meet-us, accessed June 1, 2011.
From a positivist viewpoint, case study methodology is critiqued primarily on the basis that it focuses on unique phenomena and/or local contexts rather than on achieving generalizability and universal application. While previous research suggests that university-community tourism planning and development has been and is found throughout the U.S. and the UK (Connell, 2006; Connell, 2008; Gunn, 2002), the present study deliberately focuses on PLGUs involved with tourism planning and development. While the study is limited in its ability to apply findings universally (i.e., to all university-community tourism planning and development cases in the U.S.), generalizability is not an essential goal of case study research.

The research project also aims to clarify roles of PLGUs in the complex dynamics of placemaking which includes collaboration, power conflict, public participation, competition, and potential rewards and complications of place image that can affect both universities and surrounding communities. Institutional ethnography (IE), therefore, was employed as a lens for case study data collection and analysis. As with case study methodology, generalizability is not the goal of IE; rather, the goal is to find and describe social processes that have generalizing effects. Thus interviewees located somewhat differently are understood to be subject, in various ways, to discursive and organizational processes that shape their activities. These institutional processes may produce similarities of experience, or they may organize various settings to sustain broader inequalities . . . The general relevance of the inquiry comes, then, not from a claim that local settings are similar, but from the capacity of the research to disclose features of ruling that operate across many local settings . . . IE is driven by the search to discover “how it happens” . . . (Maher and Tetreault, 2007, p. 371-372)

In keeping with the predominant grounded theory framework for this study, IE is inductive, non-prescriptive, and open to iterative refinement based on the researcher’s observations and experience in the field.

There is no “one way” to conduct an IE investigation; rather, there is an analytic
project that can be realized in diverse ways. IE investigations are rarely planned out fully in advance. . . that is why it is difficult to specify in advance exactly what the research will consist of. (ibid., p. 373)

Indeed, at this point in the research project, I can articulate details of the IE case study approach with some level of cognizance. In the spirit of transparency, I admit that the serendipitous nature of IE has been one of the most exciting and vexing aspects of the research project.

Case selection: Defining community.

The term “community” is used throughout the study for various reasons. PLGUs, unlike their private and non-land-grant public counterparts, have public service missions shaped by the Wisconsin Idea, which suggests that the boundaries of the campus are the boundaries of the state (McDowell, 2011). Throughout the 20th century, PLGUs have upheld missions rooted in the Wisconsin Idea. The idea that PLGUs’ public service efforts are mandated to affect various geographic scales – from municipalities, to regions within states, to entire states– is a critical assumption to note when examining the roles of PLGUs in public service.

This study assumes that the Wisconsin Idea applies philosophically to all public land-grant institutions; therefore, activities that are tied to PLGUs’ public service mission are understood to encompass local, regional, and statewide scales. When community is used in reference to the two PLGU case study institutions, I am referring to one or more of the following geographic scales: the institution’s surrounding neighborhood area; the municipality and/or county within which it is based; or the tourism region with which it is affiliated; or, in rare instances, the entire state. In writing the case studies, I have attempted to denote geographic areas as clearly as possible.
The two PLGU case studies – Rutgers University and Alcorn State University – were selected based on the capacity levels determined through the national inventory, as well as the researcher’s knowledge of tourism planning and development characteristics and initiatives within the regions where these institutions are located. Table 2 lists the case study institutions with their communities by geographic scale. Where applicable, tourism planning and development mechanisms are identified for each. Tourism planning and development efforts with which the case study institutions are known to be affiliated also are mentioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLGU and communities</th>
<th>Tourism planning and development mechanisms</th>
<th>Community tourism partnership effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey</td>
<td>Cooperative extension tourism</td>
<td>Opportunity Newark (municipal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities: New Brunswick/Piscataway (flagship campus)</td>
<td>Conference and event services</td>
<td>Crossroads of the American Revolution NHA (regional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark (campus)</td>
<td>Visitor information centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties: Middlesex and Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Gateway tourism region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mississippi Delta NHA (regional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality: Alcorn, Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County: Claiborne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Lower Mississippi Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collection.**

Three primary data collection and verification techniques were used for the case studies: (1) direct and participant observation; (2) semi-structured expert and phone survey interviews; and (3) material review. Observation, interviewing, and material review are considered the three most commonly used forms of data collection in qualitative studies (Miles & Huberman, 1994).
**Direct and participant observation.**

For the Rutgers case study, direct and participant observations derived primarily from my experiences as a graduate student and employee of the university, as well as a resident of New Brunswick and Newark, NJ, over the past eight years. More specifically, graduate assistantship experiences at the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers-New Brunswick, career and professional development experiences with the Office of University-Community Partnerships at Rutgers-Newark, as well as civic involvement with Leadership Newark, all afforded me opportunities to develop critical relationships and gain necessary entrée for interpreting the culture of these places within the Gateway tourism region.

For the Alcorn State University case study, informal direct and participant observations occurred intermittently over a seven-year period. A more formal observation period occurred in August 2010 which involved interactions with residents of the Mississippi Delta at gathering places (e.g., churches, restaurants, stores) in various communities throughout the region, including Mississippi towns of Cleveland, Indianola, Greenwood, and Vicksburg, as well as Memphis, TN. I also attended a Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area board meeting held in Clarksdale, MS.

**Interviews.**

I completed in-person interviews with 16 higher education, tourism, economic development, and community resident experts. These interviews were conducted between July 2010 and June 2011 and usually took place in respondents’ offices, with a few occurring in public places. Interviews typically lasted about one hour, with a few cases taking considerably less time (20-30 minutes) and more time (2.5 hours).
Phone survey interviews also were conducted to gather insights from respondents at universities across the U.S. A total of 157 phone survey interviews were conducted from April through June 2011. This total is comprised of 29 cooperative extension office representatives, 86 conference and event services representative, and 71 campus visitor information representatives.

*Material review.*

As part of the observation of materials and artifacts, when available, I reviewed travel marketing brochures and other collateral material pertaining to each region. Pertinent websites for the case study PLGUs also were reviewed.

**Limitations of the study**

In the spirit of transparency, there are a few primary limitations of the study that should be noted.

The paucity of prior research on this topic makes it exploratory and, therefore, reliant on self-reported data from phone survey and in-person interview respondents. With regard to the case studies in particular, due to sensitive topics surrounding endemic race, class, and power issues, some respondents were concerned about confidentiality, even though they signed Institutional Review Board-approved forms assuring that their identities would be protected. Indeed, a few respondents opted to share some of their thoughts and opinions “off the record,” as it were, because they were concerned about jeopardizing professional and personal relationships.

In light of these concerns, I have attempted to be particularly careful about source attribution throughout the study. As a result, replicating the study with similar subjects may be difficult because some respondents’ position titles within their organizations and
even their specific geographic locations had to be altered. Moreover, verifying expert sources also would be a challenge.

Finally, with regard to methodology, the study is reliant on web-based data to conduct a semiotic analysis of how PLGUs use language and images to promote their involvement with tourism planning and development as community engagement. Many of these websites were accessed between March and July of 2011. Websites are subject to constant and sometimes rapid visual and textual alterations. Verification of these sources may be difficult, if not impossible, within a year or less from the completion of this study. Herein, I thought it critically important to include copious visual evidence (i.e., screenshots) of source websites throughout the study.

Structure of the dissertation

Chapter 2 consists of the study’s literature review. Because university-community tourism planning and development is a nascent area of inquiry, the main purpose of the literature review is not to identify theoretical gaps, per se; rather, I attempt to identify connections among three primary bodies of literature that have provided theoretical and practical grounding and insights for this research project: (1) higher education public service literature; (2) urban planning literature; and (3) tourism planning literature. As stated above, the research design is influenced by inductive, interpretive approaches. Thus, the study’s research questions and guiding hypotheses were developed through a process of iterative refinement using concepts highlighted in the literature review as well as observations and conversations in the field. The research questions are recapped throughout the literature review. The chapter concludes with a proposed representation of
how university-community tourism planning and development concepts may be understood within overlapping areas of the three bodies of literature.

Chapter 3 provides a national inventory of PLGU tourism planning and development capacities. The chapter includes a brief history of PLGUs in the U.S. and the emergence of university-community tourism planning and development activity. The inventory provides a detailed picture of the various levels at which PLGUs are involved with tourism planning and development. It also provides a basis for comparing and contrasting among PLGUs and other research universities in the U.S.

Chapter 4 presents two case studies of PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development: Rutgers University in New Jersey and Alcorn State University in Mississippi, respectively. Finally, chapter 5 provides a summary analysis of the research and recommendations for further inquiry.
Chapter II

Making Place for University-Community Tourism Planning and Development:

A Synthesis of (Tourism) Planning and Higher Ed Public Service Paradigms

As stated previously, the literature review for this study is viewed as textual data that can help to locate university-community tourism planning and development within established theory and scholarly debate. For an emerging area of research, such an effort in theoretical framing is an important step towards explaining and understanding a phenomenon about which there is limited research.

In this vein, I propose that a meaningful theoretical framework for the university-community tourism planning and development phenomenon emerges through a synthesis of concepts among three primary bodies of literature: (1) higher education public service literature; (2) urban planning literature; and (3) tourism planning literature. Through my readings, I have observed linguistic and thematic parallels across these bodies of literature. Figure 4 illustrates these parallels, as well as a developmental trajectory that I have observed among the three bodies of literature. These observations have helped to shape the research questions and guiding hypotheses for this study, which are recapped throughout the literature review.

With regard to Figure 4, tourism planning paradigms and their definitions and methods abound in the academic literature, from traditional, positivist econometric modeling and resource analysis treatments (Gearing et al., 1976; Lawson and Baud-Bovy, 1977) to community- and systems-based interpretations acknowledging cultural, geographic, economic, environmental, social, and political dimensions and implications (Getz, 1986; Holcomb, 1999; Inskeep, 1987; Jamal and Getz, 1995; Mason, 2003; du Cros, 2001). Gunn’s treatment of tourism planning is preferred for this study as he
advocates a systems approach, rooted in the idea that “most tourism planning approaches have also been influenced by the field of urban and rural planning” (2002, p. 7). Gunn’s work illuminates parallels between tourism planning concepts and broader planning theories, as well as connections with other fields of study relevant to this research project. In Figure 4, the dotted line between the urban planning and tourism planning literatures suggests the influence of the former on the latter. The dotted line between these literatures and constructivist concepts in higher education public service literature paradigm suggests parallels as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism planning literature</th>
<th>Modern tourism</th>
<th>Postmodern tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass tourism</td>
<td>Collaborative tourism planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun and sea destination development</td>
<td>Community-based tourism planning</td>
<td>Holistic, systems-based development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable forms of tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ecotourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- cultural heritage tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- rural tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban planning literature</th>
<th>Rational planning model</th>
<th>Placemaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative planning</td>
<td>Communicative planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher education public service literature</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative extension</td>
<td>Service learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory action research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Allmendinger (2002); Friedmann (1987) and Gunn (2002); Holcomb (1998); Mason (2003); Weerts and Sandmann (2008); and Yiftachel (1989)
The literature review proceeds as follows:

I. Community engagement in U.S. higher education: a movement towards placemaking?

II. From (tourism) planning and development to (tourism) placemaking:
Sustainable forms of tourism as placemaking

III. Issues of place-based approaches to tourism: Collaboration, power conflict, place competitiveness, and destination image

IV. PLGUs and tourism planning and development: an engagement in the (place) making?

I. The community engagement movement in U.S. higher education: a movement towards placemaking?

As mentioned previously, literature specifically focusing on university-community tourism planning and development is scarce. Research on university-community engagement in general, however, has experienced such a significant level of interest over the past decade that it is considered a national movement in the U.S. higher education sector (Sandmann, 2006).

Outreach vs. engagement: Is there a difference?

University-community engagement is understood as a departure from unidirectional or one-way public service efforts on the part of research universities. University outreach and cooperative extension – as a nearly 100-year-old method of PLGU public service delivery – has been identified in the literature as the embodiment of the one-way public service model. By the 1970s, the outreach model was found to be

---

4 PLGU cooperative extension was established nationally in the U.S. by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914.
inadequate for addressing increasingly complex social problems surrounding poverty and race. Nonetheless, the model has persisted, though not without its critics.

Outreach, as a term and concept, is viewed as universities providing knowledge resources (e.g., faculty expertise, technical assistance, cooperative extension) directly to communities rather than with community input or collaboration (Weerts, 2007; Sandmann, 2006). Herein, outreach is critiqued as a positivist mode of public service that creates top-down, paternalistic town-gown power relationships rather than cultures of reciprocity and collaboration among universities and community stakeholders based on mutual understandings of knowledge production (Rhodes, 2001; Sandmann and Weerts, 2008). Moreover, outreach is critiqued as an approach that reifies organizational silos within universities rather than an approach that effectively integrates and leverages universities’ research and teaching functions (Byrne, 1998; Leviton, 1999; Ray, 1999; Simpson, 2000).

Engagement, by contrast, is claimed to be an improvement on the one-way outreach model because it envisions communities and universities working together to produce and share knowledge. Whereas outreach is said to be underpinned by a value-neutral, detached, and objective conception of knowledge production, engagement is considered a product of a constructivist worldview.

Constructivism suggests that knowledge process is local, complex, and dynamic. In this paradigm, learning takes place in the context and place in which knowledge is applied. . . . a “community of learners” . . . In a constructivist paradigm, dissemination strategies vary considerably from the unidirectional model. Instead of broadcasting knowledge and offering alternatives to users, boundary spanners act as conveners, problem solvers, and change agents who negotiate the wants and needs of parties involved in the process of creating and disseminating knowledge metaphor. (Weerts and Sandmann, 2008, pp. 78-9)
Thus, the engagement movement envisions universities working with communities to identify common issues and opportunities and working together to devise solutions to shared challenges. Engagement aims to provide opportunities for multiple voices and perspectives within higher education to come to bear on social issues through local partnerships. A number of case studies point to a range of roles that higher education institutions play in engagement, from community organizing-oriented roles involving collaboration, mediation, and resident empowerment to more specialized roles involving workforce and small business development, neighborhood commercial revitalization, tech innovation incubation, and real estate development (Fox, Truehaft, and Douglass, 2006; Maurrasse, 2001; Reardon, 1998). As such, the university-community engagement project seeks to construct diverse, reciprocal service pathways beyond one-way outreach approaches like agricultural cooperative extension. University-community tourism planning and development is understood as a possible addition to such public service pathways.

Engagement also aims to cut across traditional research, teaching, and service functions, thereby integrating them for the mutual benefit of institutions and community partners (Sandmann, 2006). Engagement, thus, suggests the inculcation of placemaking into university missions which entails universities working collaboratively with local and regional entities to maintain or improve economic opportunity and overall quality of life in surrounding municipalities and regions. Alperovitz, Dubb, and Howard (2008) suggest that an engagement approach to public service also is linked to placemaking:

At a time when federal and state subsidies are being cut and charitable programs are proving insufficient to meet growing local needs, channeling university financial resources and expertise toward place-based development models can help produce the kind of economic stability that is a requirement of strong, vibrant, healthy, and democratic communities. (p. 71)
The Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities and its Kellogg Commission of the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities provide a veritable engagement manifesto. It encompasses Holland’s applied profession-based engagement themes of community, social, cultural, human, and economic development, as well as the Carnegie Foundation’s value-based engagement themes of mutuality, partnership, reciprocity, democratic citizenship, and the public good. In the report, *Returning to Our Roots: Executive Summaries of the Reports of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities*, the Commission explains that university-community engagement is a response to publicly held images of research universities as entities removed from and indifferent towards societal issues.

One challenge we face is growing public frustration with what is seen to be our unresponsiveness. At the root of the criticism is a perception that we are out of touch and out of date. Another part of the issue is that although society has problems, our institutions have “disciplines.” In the end, what these complaints add up to is a perception that, despite the resources and expertise available on our campuses, our institutions are not well organized to bring them to bear on local problems in a coherent way. . . .

Against that backdrop, this Commission concludes that it is time to go beyond outreach and service to what the Kellogg Commission defines as “engagement.” By engagement, we refer to institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined.

Engagement goes well beyond extension, conventional outreach, and even most conceptions of public service. Inherited concepts emphasize a one-way process in which the university transfers its expertise to key constituents. Embedded in the engagement ideal is a commitment to sharing and reciprocity. By engagement the Commission envisions partnerships, two-way streets defined by mutual respect among the partners for what each brings to the table. An institution that responds to these imperatives can properly be called what the
Kellogg Commission has come to think of as an “engaged institution.” (2001, p. 13)5

Community and regional development activities on the part of universities, however, may not be motivated by an engagement ethos. As stated previously, PLGU cooperative extension has been squared with outreach in the higher education public service literature. With regard to cooperative extension tourism, Gunn maintains that “[b]ecause [universities] have no vested interest and can be objective, they often serve as catalysts to bring many factions together to resolve community planning conflicts.”

Gunn’s statement that universities have the capacity to be “objective” because they “have no vested interest” (2002, p. 14) assumes that universities are socially, economically, and even physically disconnected from surrounding communities. This assumption, while perhaps accepted more readily as a truism in the outreach paradigm, is anathema to engagement. Within the engagement paradigm, universities are viewed as embedded or anchored in their communities, with the fortunes and failures of both inextricably tied.

Institutions of higher education have an obvious vested interest in building strong relationships with the communities that surround their campuses. They do not have the option of relocating and thus are of necessity place-based anchors. While corporations, businesses, and residents often flee from economically depressed low-income urban and suburban edge-city neighborhoods, universities remain. . . . universities are inherently an important potential institutional base for helping community-based economic development in general, and civically engaged development in particular (Alperovitz, Dubb, and Howard, 2008, p. 71).

Within the engagement paradigm, the role of a university as an expert convener shifts from that of an objective, value-free entity with supposedly limited investment to a participatory stakeholder that acknowledges freely its own diverse interests (e.g., research

and publishing opportunities) while creating opportunities to match its interests strategically with those of other stakeholders. In its own enlightened self-interest (Maurrasse, 2001), an engaged university would seek to turn a planning conflict into a win-win situation that benefits both the institution and community partners.

This conceptual engagement scenario mirrors a March 2011 planning meeting for the Newark Promise Neighborhoods Initiative (NPNI). Promise Neighborhoods is a federally-funded program intended to “significantly improve the educational and developmental outcomes of children and youth in [the nation’s] most distressed communities, and to transform those communities” by increasing collaborative service capacity among education institutions and community-based social service organizations within a defined community area. 6 While the NPNI project proposal had not been awarded a planning grant from the U.S. Department of Education, NPNI was still eligible to compete for an implementation grant. University and community stakeholders were brought together at Rutgers-Newark (R-N) to discuss if they should continue to focus their planning efforts in Newark’s Fairmount neighborhood or shift planning and implementation energies to another neighborhood area altogether. R-N’s Office of University-Community Partnerships (OUCP), in cooperation with the Center for Collaborative Change, convened and facilitated a portion of the roundtable discussion, performing in a neutral role, while R-N faculty representatives expressed the university’s strong interest in developing research from NPNI regardless of the neighborhood area selected. Community-based social service entities, however, strongly advocated that NPNI remain focused on the Fairmount neighborhood. A heartfelt and sometimes heated

discussion ensued among the partners comparing Fairmount’s needs versus the needs of other Newark neighborhoods. OUCP managed to help the partners arrive at a win-win solution: continue NPNI’s focus on the Fairmount neighborhood where services are needed while allowing Rutgers faculty members to serve as program evaluators, which preserved the university’s interest in gathering and analyzing data for research. OUCP likely will continue in its role as NPNI’s convener, providing a space for resolving conflict in both the interest of the university and its community partners.

The philosophical recasting of community outreach as community engagement, therefore, is viewed as an attempt to refurbish not only the public service mission of research universities but their research and teaching missions as well. Yet, in its various forms, community engagement also may be creating complications more than it addresses them. A key premise of the engagement movement is the assertion that universities and surrounding communities should not operate as separate entities. Yet, when university-sponsored events are decried publicly for creating unsafe environments for their municipalities, it becomes rather clear that engagement ideals of reciprocity and mutuality can carry negative implications for the places that institutions and communities share. One illustrative example is RutgersFest, a 30-year-old annual outdoor music festival sponsored by Rutgers-New Brunswick that was cancelled by the institution’s president after a series of group brawls and shootings occurred in the downtown New Brunswick area after the event. Traditionally restricted to Rutgers students, by 2011, RutgersFest had peaked as a major event attracting an estimated 40 to 50,000 attendees, many of whom were reported to have been students from area high schools and colleges and non-student visitors as well. The New Brunswick chief of police coined 2011 RutgersFest as “the worst thing of the year for the city of New Brunswick,” and blamed
the university’s administrative leadership for compromising the city’s safety (Heyboer, 2011).

Engagement also is said to advance plurality, which can carry both positive and negative implications. Indeed, “[a]s colleges and universities become more diverse, fragmented, specialized, and connected with other social systems” through research, teaching, and service activities that promote and/or leverage external partnerships and collaboration, their “missions do not become clearer; rather, they multiply and become sources of stress and conflict rather than integration. . . . they simultaneously embrace a number of conflicting goals” (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 11). The perception that missions are unclear and that goals are conflicting is especially problematic for PLGUs, as the higher education sector in the U.S. has begun to operate in a remarkable era of public accountability.

**Engagement in a 21st century era of accountability.**

In recent years, the higher education sector in the U.S. has been challenged to respond increasingly to expectations related to student learning, graduation rates, workforce readiness, and overall proof of return on investment of public funds. This new era of accountability has been linked to what is known in higher education circles as the Spellings Report, a 2006 federal study conducted by the Commission on the Future of Higher Education under the aegis of former U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings. In the report and related issue papers, impetuses and arguments for publicly endorsed, results-driven accountability measures are presented thusly:

We have noted a remarkable shortage of clear, accessible information about crucial aspects of American colleges and universities, from financial aid to graduation rates. . . . This lack of useful data and accountability *hinders*
policymakers and the public from making informed decisions and prevents higher education from demonstrating its contribution to the public good (Commission on the Future of Higher Education 2006, p. 20, emphasis added).

Higher education is beset from all constituencies for improved evidence of its effectiveness. In a time of scarce resources, and at the urging of concerned citizens, public officials at all levels are increasingly demanding justification for the higher costs of higher education. Many employers question the qualifications of current college graduates. . . . “What do students really learn?” and “What’s the value-added?” are questions increasingly being asked across America. Demands on institutions include calls for more transparency about real costs, and for new measures of quality and productivity. The nexus between improved accountability and the likelihood of renewed support is ever tighter (Miller and Oldham, 2006, p. 2, emphasis added).

With a direct emphasis on external consumer/customer and investor (i.e., taxpayer) review and satisfaction, it seems that the higher education accountability movement and the university-community engagement movement perhaps have common goals and values. The Spellings Report’s six higher education reform recommendations include (1) improving higher education access and persistence, particularly among low-income students; (2) restructuring the federal financial aid system to address rising costs of higher education; (3) creating cultures of accountability and transparency based on measureable performance vs. institutional reputation; (4) developing innovative pedagogies, curricula, and technologies to improve learning, particularly in science and mathematical literacy; (5) encouraging lifelong learning, particularly among adults; and (6) developing the nation’s capacity for global competitiveness in knowledge-intensive fields such as science, engineering, and medicine (Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 2006). Broader access to learning and technological resources that higher education institutions offer is a salient theme here. This overarching theme dovetails with public accessibility and institutional responsiveness values that have been identified as characteristics of engaged universities (Kellogg Commission, 1999).
Yet, the Spellings Report does not mention university-community engagement in its recommendations. Ironically, while the assertion that higher education is accountable to external publics permeates the report, recommendations encouraging universities to engage in research, teaching, or other activities towards addressing community-based and/or broader societal issues are noticeably absent. This may suggest that while community engagement has captured the imagination and attention of some stakeholders who see it as one of several means by which research universities contribute to society, there still are others who are unaware of its growing influence, who are not yet convinced of its effectiveness, or who do not view it as one of universities’ core mission areas.

It is widely recognized that U.S. research universities conduct cutting-edge research that fuels national innovation and educates the technical leaders of tomorrow, but it may not be as widely appreciated that major research universities also support a broad array of public service activities in their communities. Faculty members and staff - and especially students - around the country are helping improve the quality of life in their communities, often in support of the most disadvantaged residents.7

A cultural shift may be needed in order for the community engagement movement to be effective and recognized; a cultural shift not only among external stakeholders but within higher education institutions themselves. In the same year that the Spellings Report was released, Gibson (2006) observed that the engagement movement has miles to go before genuinely democratic, engaged, and civic colleges and universities characterize all of American higher education. . . . Specifically, universities, especially research universities, must entertain and adopt new forms of scholarship—those that link the intellectual assets of higher education institutions to solving public problems and issues. Achieving this goal will necessitate the creation of a new epistemology . . . New forms of pedagogy and teaching will also be required, as well as new ways of thinking about how institutions are structured, organized, and administered (p. 5).

---

Three engagement capacity challenges in the face of accountability: perception, commitment, and support.

As a fairly recent and continuously developing movement that still is gaining awareness within higher education, community engagement requires just as much, or perhaps more, internal work as it does external work for it to be legitimized both as a scholarly endeavor and a social benefit. Moreover, as indicated above, university-community engagement claims to be an expansion of traditional research university outreach functions. This presents the engagement agenda with three primary challenges.

**Capacity challenge 1: Perception.**

The first challenge relates to the perception of community engagement ideology within the academy. Referred to as the “third mission” (Roper and Hirth, 2005), public service and outreach has an enduring stigma within higher education as the least important – and, therefore, most expendable – aspect of research universities’ three-pronged mission (Maurrasse, 2001). The university-community engagement movement is likely to inherit this perception in institutional settings where public service and outreach units have been viewed and treated as lesser functions and/or lower priorities (Gibson 2006), regardless of ideological refurbishments (e.g., two-way vs. one-way interaction) and a fresh nomenclature suggesting active, mutual interest between town and gown (e.g., terms such as collaboration, partnership, and trust are common in the engagement literature). Engagement scholars agree that institutional university-community partnership efforts tend to be more sustainable when they are integrated with the core functions of research universities – research (e.g., scholarship of engagement) and teaching (e.g., service learning) – and when key institutional leaders support and drive the
integration process (Maurrasse, 2001; McDowell, 2001; Sandmann, 2006).

**Capacity challenge 2: Institutional commitment.**

Some scholars argue that another challenge for university-community engagement is building a culture of commitment within the institutions themselves. In particular, there is an expressed need for PLGUs to revive social contracts with states that have been treated primarily with ambivalence over the latter half of the 20th century (Havelock, 1969; Taylor, 1981). McDowell (2001) observes that a renewed commitment to public service is a function of geography, socio-political environment, and the leadership and visionary capacity of land-grant cooperative extension. He describes an uneven national landscape in which there will continue to be a strong commitment to public service in some states and a weaker commitment in others:

The original mission of the land-grant university is being renegotiated in some places and abandoned in others. In some places, the renegotiating of the social contract is being lead by extension, and in other places, extension is being left behind . . . As land-grant universities move into the 21st century, some of them will be land-grant universities by name and history only, and some will again be people’s universities. Some will be “state-supported” universities, some will be “state-assisted” universities, and some will be “state-located” universities” (p. 13).

Furthermore, it may be difficult to develop internal (as well as external) cultures of engagement if institutions are not clear on or are ambivalent about distinctions in terminology. McDowell observes that public service, outreach, and engagement are viewed as synonyms with “some ambiguity in the distinctions” among them, as each term is employed “depend[ing] on who you are and whom you are addressing” (p. 15). While some flexibility in term usage may be necessary as the engagement movement continues to gain momentum, institutions that are attempting to build an engagement culture also may need to educate faculty, staff, and students (as well as community stakeholders) as to the shift in values and approaches that “engagement” connotes. Indeed, some universities
have renamed public service units to reflect this shift, while others define “outreach” using engagement concepts. For example, Outreach at Penn State University is a PLGU public service unit that defines its mission (“catalyst, collaborator, and connector”), vision (“aggressively advanc[ing] the University as the premier innovative, engaged institution of higher education in the country. . . enrich[ing] the lives of citizens and communities in the Commonwealth and beyond”), and approach to scholarship (“a two-way process through which the active exchange of information with external audiences occurs”) using engagement concepts and terminology while retaining the “outreach” banner.8

Of course, renaming departments and replacing old language with new terminology does not mean necessarily that an engagement ethos has been inculcated within an institution’s culture and policies or that engagement values are being embraced and demonstrated by an institution’s individual representatives.

Moreover, there are no national accreditation standards governing engagement, so assessing one institution’s level of engagement over another’s is difficult. Indeed, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching provides the following disclaimer regarding its Community Engagement classification:

Because of their voluntary nature, elective classifications do not represent a comprehensive national assessment: an institution's absence from the Community Engagement classification should not be interpreted as reflecting a judgment about the institution's commitment to its community.9

---

Capacity challenge 3: Public support and advocacy.

A third challenge involves public support, which encompasses funding as well as advocacy. As a two-way expansion of traditional public service and outreach, community engagement points to a need for increased state and federal support. Yet, as suggested in the previously referenced Spellings Report issues papers, such support in a resource scarce environment is, at worst, highly unlikely, and at best, comes with ever more stringent accountability expectations. The former scenario seems to be closer to reality than the latter, particularly as state-supported public research universities have been faced with steady reduction in funding over the years (APLU, 2008). With a well ingrained perception that public service and outreach is secondary – or even tertiary – to core mission areas of research and teaching, community engagement efforts may become completely reliant on so-called “soft money” support, i.e., grant funding from foundations and even consulting contracts from municipal governments and local nonprofit organizations.

In addition, the advocacy base for community engagement in its various forms may be perceived as too dispersed. A number of organizations have hopped on the proverbial university-community engagement bandwagon as the next big idea in higher education. While such interest may bring a populist aura to the movement which can help to draw more attention and resources, popular support and interest eventually can fade without strong, well-organized, national advocacy networks that help to solidify engagement as necessary, accountable, results-oriented, and worthy of monetary and human capital investment. Without this, the engagement movement could remain just that: a movement that is supported in a few university environments, given lip-service in some, and treated as tangential rather than integral to research and teaching in others.
The Higher Education Network for Community Engagement (HENCE) is one coalition established to address this need. Formed in 2006, HENCE is a “response to the growing need to deepen, consolidate, and advance the literature, research, practice, policy, and advocacy for community engagement as a core element of higher education's role in society.”\(^{10}\) It is a national advocacy network of over 30 organizations of various types including universities (e.g., Michigan State University, The Ohio State University), institution-based research centers (e.g., Service-Learning Research and Development Center at University of California-Berkeley; New England Resource Center for Higher Education at University of Massachusetts-Boston), higher education associations (e.g., American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy; American Association of State Colleges and Universities), and scholarly journals (e.g., Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement; Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning). Indeed, the diversity of higher education organizations participating in HENCE may be attributed to the engagement movement’s ever-broadening appeal. However, as suggested previously, higher education organizations are critiqued as having multiple rather than clear, integrated missions (Birnbaum, 1988). While some of HENCE’s participating organizations are focused more narrowly on engagement activities like service-learning, others like higher education associations and entire universities represent an array of mission and policy perspectives. Herein, critics may view the engagement policy agenda as an indication of core mission creep (i.e., teaching, research) in the higher education sector. While proponents may argue that engagement is all about integrating the tripartite mission of universities, traditionalist views of higher education – as reflected in the

\(^{10}\) For a description of HENCE, see the National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement’s website at http://ncsue.msu.edu/collaborations.aspx. The website for HENCE (http://henceonline.org/) originally accessed in April 2011. The HENCE website was not accessible in September 2011.
teaching- and research-focused recommendations of the Spellings Report – are demanding proof.

*     *     *

These caveats for the community engagement movement assume that the Spellings Report is a seminal, authoritative document that will continue to inform higher education policy and U.S. education policy overall. Though the Spellings Report was commissioned and completed under the George W. Bush administration, nearly half a decade later, President Barack Obama’s January 2010 State of the Union address echoes its sentiments with regard to results-driven accountability as a means to reform a U.S. educational system in peril:

Now, this year, we've broken through the stalemate between left and right by launching a national competition to improve our schools. And the idea here is simple: instead of rewarding failure, we only reward success. Instead of funding the status quo, we only invest in reform -- reform that raises student achievement; inspires students to excel in math and science; and turns around failing schools that steal the future of too many young Americans, from rural communities to the inner city. In the 21st century, the best anti-poverty program around is a world-class education. . . . And by the way, it's time for colleges and universities to get serious about cutting their own costs, because they, too, have a responsibility to help solve this problem. (emphasis added)11

The vision of the university-community engagement movement involves bringing seemingly disparate, highly specialized university functions to bear on community and societal issues, thus demonstrating the value and power of multidisciplinary perspectives that universities can bring to societal issues. Universities, higher education associations, and entities that are joining the engagement movement perhaps reflect the excitement, energy, and broad diversity that supposedly characterize the movement. These

---

characteristics, arguably, are among the movement’s strengths; however, in an era of accountability, these organizations will need to be in the position to advocate for long-term support of engagement efforts based on consistent performance and verifiable results.

Given the capacity challenges of internal perceptions, institutional commitment, and public support that public research universities are likely to face while attempting to engage communities in an era of accountability, perhaps the more that these institutions can demonstrate how they advance the public good while advancing their own interests, the better. This reciprocal benefits exchange suggests enlightened self-interest (Maurrasse, 2001), a social capital sustainability ethic that speaks to motivations underpinning two-way, university-community engagement activity. Perhaps the way to alter perceptions of traditional university outreach and to renew institutional commitment to public service is to show how exercising enlightened self-interest through engagement mechanisms actually can benefit both public research universities and some of the various constituencies that support them.

Furthermore, public universities may be able to demonstrate that they are worthy of increased public investment by engaging in self-sustaining activities that also create economic and social opportunities for surrounding communities and regions. University-community tourism planning and development could be such an activity; however, the capacity challenges noted above contribute to an uneven national landscape with regard to institutions’ willingness or ability to do engagement, as McDowell points out (2001).

Before we can assess the engagement potential of PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development, we first must gain a sense of the capacity of
institutions to be involved, as well as sense of where this activity may be taking place. Research question 1 focuses on this initial task. It informs the creation of a national inventory that aims to document and compare university capacities for tourism planning and development.

**Research question 1: How are PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacities distinguished from PLGUs with lower capacities?**

*Guiding hypothesis: PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacities tend to use place-based, community engagement-oriented images and language in their marketing, which is creating a level of innovation that relegates PLGUs with lower tourism planning and development capacities to a perceived state of lower placemaking status.*

**II. From (tourism) planning and development to engaged (tourism) placemaking:**

**Sustainable forms of tourism as placemaking**

The project to unseat the unidirectional university outreach model with the two-way engagement model may be likened to the developmental trajectory of planning theory. Further, as Figure 4 (p. 37) suggests, planning literature has influenced tourism planning literature so that it reflects a similar trajectory. Parallels between these two bodies of literature are critical to observe in this effort to frame university-community tourism planning and development within planning theory. Moreover, university-community engagement – and community-based tourism planning and development, in particular – are linked to placemaking.
Parallel evolutions?: Planning paradigms and university-community outreach and engagement.

Like the one-way university outreach model, the rational planning model is said to be premised upon positivistic epistemology (Forester, 1989; Friedmann, 1987; Sandercock, 1998; Weerts, 2007). Positivism has been described in the planning literature as advocating a “predictive” view of society, a “universalist perspective on knowledge,” and a “reliance on a narrowly empirical mode of inquiry” (Fischer, 2000, pp. 69-70). Planners and other social scientists ensconced in this tradition are viewed as being driven by “a sweeping rational engineering of all aspects of social life in order to improve the human condition” (Scott, 2003, p. 126).

The roots of planning theory are traced to the first Ph.D. program in planning education and research established after World War II at The University of Chicago. Previously, planning education was centered on an urban reform agenda that sought merit in application, as with the Progressive Era’s City Beautiful movement and the social planning and housing and community development actions of Jane Addams’ Hull House and the national Settlement House movement. The template for planning education formulated at The University of Chicago, however, privileged theory over practice, which necessitated the recasting of planning as a “legitimate academic discipline.” Planning joined the fold of the social sciences, and with that alignment came the effort to make planning conform to generally deductive pedagogical approaches and methods of inquiry. Academicians emerged who “did not see themselves as practitioners” and who “looked for validation within academia rather than without.” Like other social sciences experiencing physics envy, planning was working towards becoming a normal science with one dominant paradigm: “a comprehensive, rational model of problem solving and

Sandercock (1998) critiques the rational comprehensive planning model as viewing the public as “an undifferentiated, homogeneous group in which differences of class, or race, or gender, were not considered relevant input.” She suggests that planning education continues to be a major proponent of this view.

By emphasizing rational/objective analysis through such courses as quantitative methods, modeling, use of computers and so on, we create expectations that favor explicit preestablished goals which can be met by planning procedures that favor such methods. A whole planning culture has been built around privileging such methods (p. 170).

As suggested previously, scholars within the university-community engagement movement critique the one-way outreach model in a similar fashion. During the 1970s, a pivotal decade marking the breakdown of modernist hegemony and the emergence of a series of “posts”, among them post-Fordism, postmodernism, and postpositivism,

the unidirectional model of outreach increasingly drew critics, especially in social science fields. Researchers acknowledged that complex social problems like poverty and racism were not easily addressed through a linear paradigm of knowledge dissemination. In school settings, for example, the unidirectional model was increasingly shown as ineffective since it failed to take into account the intended recipients’ motivations and contexts. Specifically, researchers learned that top-down programs were ineffective in institutionalizing ideas as part of local schools’ curricula. Their analysis led them to reject the assumption that one can simply pass on information to a set of users and expect learning to result. (Weerts and Sandmann, 2008, p. 78)

Friedmann’s (1987) and Yiftachel’s (1989) typologies of planning theory also suggest a fragmentation or paradigm breakdown in the early 1970s that led to the emergence of not quite “post” but nonetheless alternative planning models including advocacy planning and equity planning. As with efforts to distinguish outreach from
engagement in higher education public service, the question becomes whether or not claims that these approaches are truly alternative have merit or if the approaches – and their heralds – carry with them the residue of the dominant paradigm, as Allmendinger’s (2002) postpositivist critique of Friedmann’s “timescale”-based (p. 81) and Yiftachel’s “linear” (p. 84) typologies suggests.

Communicative planning (Forester, 1999), or collaborative planning as Healey (1997; 1998) has it, is treated as a more viable alternative response to the rational comprehensive model, as it emerged as the field’s hegemonic paradigm in the 1990s (Tewdwr-Jones, 1998). Communicative planning is understood as an interactive and interpretive process in which the planner mediates between local and expert knowledge through participatory discourse with citizens. The planner guides participants in “respectful discussion . . . recognizing, valuing, listening, and searching for translative possibilities.” Argumentation involves reasoning, compromise, and conflict identification and mediation. Ideally, the communicative paradigm is viewed as a vehicle through which expert knowledge can achieve social transformation which, for its proponents, should be the primary aim of planning practice. In university-community engagement scenarios, town and gown “discourse communities” learn to co-exist while searching for common ground (Fischer, 2000; Healey, 1996, pp. 154-55).

The dominance of communicative and collaborative planning has made it vulnerable to critiques from the far left. Sandercock (1998), a proponent of radical planning, finds residue of the rational comprehensive planning model in the communicative planning model, including primacy of expert knowledge and assumptions of equal access for all citizens despite structural inequalities based on race, class, and gender. More specifically, Flyvbjerg (1998) critiques communicative planning for its
misconception of ways to empower marginalized groups through deliberative participation. Underpinning communicative planning is the idea that there is a rational approach to deliberation, which assumes that when stakeholders come to the table, all have an idea of what their needs and preferences are and that these needs and preferences will be expressed within similar norms of articulateness (Young, 2000). What is more, communicative rationality is critiqued for having little to say about how marginalized groups (e.g., women, minorities, gays, the poor) are to attain a “rational voice” that can be heard, that can persuade, and that can even effectively form a better argument against other, potentially oppressive rational voices in the public sphere (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 205). Practical applications of communicative and collaborative planning, such as public participation GIS (PPGIS), may be less imposing and invite broader input than the traditional, top-down master plan. However, after the PPGIS charettes end, planning experts still meet in offices away from the community in order to make decisions (or recommendations) with other experts like themselves with community voices susceptible to their interpretation.

As an analogue, while the engagement movement is attempting to redirect (or reimage) university public service, it risks inheriting some of the negative perceptions of outreach, its dominant predecessor. This is one reason, perhaps, that some higher education public service scholars are attempting to draw distinct epistemological lines between engagement and outreach. Despite such efforts, there is no guarantee that engagement approaches to university public service somehow will be perceived more favorably than outreach approaches, particularly as it continues to grow in popularity.

Like the residue of the rational comprehensive model that is claimed to limit communicative and collaborative planning’s conception of power, the engagement
movement may be hampered by misconceptions of power created by university outreach approaches. Higher education has figured prominently in shaping civic discourse in the U.S. As promulgators and even gatekeepers of democracy in an imperfect political system, higher education institutions have fallen short of exemplifying and safeguarding democratic ideals of equality, justice, and civic participation. As this research project notes through PLGU case studies in the urban Northeast (i.e., Rutgers University and New Jersey’s Gateway Tourism Region) and the rural South (i.e., Alcorn State University and the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area), the histories of many towns and regions shaped by public higher education institutions are extremely painful—such as when universities have played a role in maintaining systems of division and segregation, such as by supporting the proslavery elite in the antebellum period in the Southern United States, or by gentrifying surrounding low-income and working-class neighborhoods. Universities—as complex organizations—are embedded within various overlapping historical, political, and economic relationships with their surrounding communities. Community engagement initiatives must be able to come to terms with the impacts these ongoing relationships have on their ability to form meaningful partnerships. (Dempsey, 2009, p. 364)

Indeed, whether or not universities assume an engagement mode of public service may be of little consequence if local and regional partners do not trust them. First, however, the community engagement movement may need to address politics of power in collaborative planning efforts, particularly with regard to how “community” is defined; which voices have and have not been included or legitimized in defining “community”; and, if and when a “community” is located and organized, which representatives are deemed articulate and deliberative enough to express, frame, and negotiate its diverse and sometimes competing interests (Alcoff, 1991; Dempsey, 2007a, 2007b, 2010; Ganesh & Barber, 2009; Joseph, 2002; Young, 2000).
Despite these critiques of communicative-collaboration planning, there is evidence that its broad influence has forged connections with related paradigms and recent thought movements such as placemaking, sustainability, and the so-called new institutionalism in regional economics (Healey, 1999). For the purposes of this research project on tourism – which is understood as a place-based, multidisciplinary meta-industry (Gunn, 2002) – placemaking may be an apt concept for framing university-community tourism planning and development as an institutionally engaged form of tourism planning and development.

**From tourism planning to placemaking.**

For at least the past decade, tourism has been considered one of the fastest growing and most economically important industries in the world. Tourism has become an important economic development strategy for municipalities and regions. The steady growth of tourism globally is said to have contributed to increasing competition for tourist activity among emerging and established destination communities (Nelson, Butler, and Wall, 1999; World Tourism Organization, 2011).

Expenditure data reported by the U.S. Travel Association (formerly known as the Travel Industry Association of America) suggest that, domestically, tourism’s economic impacts grew steadily during the 2000s despite the 9/11 terrorist attack in 2001 and the Great Recession years that spanned the latter portion of the decade. In 2010, domestic and international travelers spent $758.7 billion in the U.S., an increase of 7.7 percent over 2009 expenditures and an increase of 29.5 percent over 2000 expenditures (see Figure 5). These increases, of course, could be attributed to increasing costs of travel and accommodations (i.e., fuel, food, energy). Nevertheless, tourism continues to be a major
growth industry in the U.S., which makes it an attractive economic development strategy for communities and regions, particularly rural areas.

One of the difficulties of measuring the economic impacts of tourism consistently has to do with how tourism and tourists are defined. Mason (2003) observes that most definitions of the term tourist are based on the concept of tourism. Usually, such definitions make reference to the need for the tourist to spend at least one night in a destination to which he or she has travelled. Tourists can be distinguished from excursionists in such definitions, as an excursionist is someone who visits and leaves without staying a night in a destination... it is relatively common today for the two terms to be combined. The term visitor is often used in preference to either tourist or excursionist... The distance travelled is often seen as important in definitions of both tourism and tourists... As with the need of at least some definitions to include reference to an overnight stay, there is a good deal of debate and unresolved confusion about distance travelled and tourism definitions (pp. 6-7).

Such debate contributes to the difficulty of demonstrating tourism’s economic potential on local scales, as well as to the perception that tourism is a fragmented and uncoordinated strategy for local community economic development (Jamal and Getz, 1994; Inskeep, 1991).
Yet, by several accounts, we are in a postmodern tourism environment that emphasizes endogenous rather than outward-looking competitiveness; cultural heterogeneity rather than homogeneity; differentiation of product offerings and de-differentiation of previously discrete tourist spheres; and flexibility in customizing tourist experiences and in implementing tourist choices (see, for example, Costa and Martinotti, 2003; Fainstein, Hoffmann, and Judd, 2003; Fainstein and Judd, 1999; Faulkner, Moscardo, and Laws, 2000; Urry, 1990). Since at least the 1980s, there has been a general recognition of the need to revisit the traditional top-down master plan approach (i.e., rational comprehensive planning) to tourism planning, as well as the mass tourism approach to tourism development that favors primarily economic impact approaches to measuring the value of tourism to municipalities and regions (Gunn, 2002; Mason, 2003).

Just as higher education public service has moved from outreach to engagement and planning theory in general has moved from positivist to multiple constructivist paradigms, tourism planning has become focused increasingly on resident community and local stakeholder participation and collaboration in generating holistic plans that involve coordination across multiple sectors and involving multiple stakeholders (Jamal and Getz, 1995). Within the tourism planning literature, this paradigm has various names, among them collaborative planning (Araujo and Bramwell, 2002; Bramwell and Sharman, 1999; Jamal and Getz, 1995); sustainable tourism development (Briassoulis, 2002; Saarinen, 2006); community- and place-based tourism development (Beritelli, 2011; Reed, 1997; Reid, Mair, and George, 2004); and, most recently, “hopeful tourism,” a primarily feminist critique of “masculinist, western research traditions” described as a paradigm shift.
[g]uided by consensual practices of cooperation, reciprocity, interdependence, activism and support, the paradigmatic shift promised by transmodernity and the dynamic feminine . . . [It is] a values-led humanist approach based on partnership, reciprocity and ethics, which aims for co-created learning and which recognises the power of sacred and indigenous knowledge and passionate scholarship. (Pritchard, Morgan, and Ateljevic, 2011, pp. 4, 8, 9)

As Figure 4 (p. 37) suggests, I observe that these constructivist paradigms dovetail with community engagement in the higher education public service literature and the communicative-collaborative model in the planning literature. Of these various paradigms, sustainable tourism development is among the most predominant.

**Power of placemaking, community engagement, and community-based tourism.**

As mentioned previously, urban scholars maintain that place competitiveness, place quality, and place attachment are critical now as economic well-being, quality of life, and self-identity have become integrated in a global network society that assigns value to individuals, organizations, cities, and regions based on perceived positions in place hierarchies (Castells, 2000; Corcoran, 2002; Drier, Mollenkopf, and Swanstrom, 2005). Arguably, Richard Florida (2002, 2008) has made a career by assessing and comparing the value of places in a knowledge-intensive, tech-savvy creative economy, as he has it. His works generally assert the critical importance and value of attracting highly-educated creative class visitors and residents to a region’s competitiveness. In particular, Florida suggests that creative class residents are effective at identifying, enhancing, and perhaps marketing through informal yet high-powered creative class networks what is unique, current, and valuable about their communities, because they tend to behave as tourists in their own places of residence.
In Florida’s formulation, members of the creative class arguably are active participants in placemaking and even community-based tourism planning and development. Smith (2001) suggests that the power of placemaking lies in the ability to create the qualities that differentiate a place; to represent or misrepresent the story of a place; to include and exclude the stories of those who shaped the place; to make relevant or irrelevant the meaning of time in a place:

This brings to the forefront the vexing question of just what makes a place a place like no other place. Phrased differently, what about a place persists and what changes over time. And this is precisely what power struggles over ‘placemaking’ are all about; namely who changes what in alternative representation of any place’s present and future and how do these changes selectively appropriate or reject particular elements of any place’s historical past? (p. 115)

Knowledge workers in so-called placemaking professions like urban and tourism planning have been viewed as wielding this kind of power. Schneekloth and Shibley warn that “the allocation of such work to a small body of professionals is fundamentally disabling to others” (1995, p. 2), which has made it possible for communicative planners, radical planners, community organizers, and creative class proponents like Florida to propose the engagement of “others” in placemaking processes and decisionmaking as a viable and potentially transformative, community empowerment alternative to top-down planning and development approaches (see, for example, Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993; Medoff and Sklar, 1994).

Based on my readings, placemaking appears to be conceptually congruent with community engagement in higher education public service, as well as community-based tourism planning and development approaches which are viewed as sustainable because destination “hosts play a central role in determining the form and process of tourism development” (Moscardo, 2008, p. 5). Costa and Martinotti (2003) suggest that
placemaking – specifically with regard to sustainable, collaborative community-based
tourism development – is tourism’s emerging planning and development framework in
the 21st century. In this alternative framework to mass tourism development, “politics of
particularity and of local economic development” hold primacy (p. 67). However,
placemaking seeks not to dismiss mass tourism altogether; rather, it attempts to balance
the broader demands of mass tourism with the social interests and needs of localities.
Herein, planners and other local authorities are expected to assume an
interorganizational, meta-management perspective rather than a traditional organization-
set perspective (Evan, 1966; Selin and Chavez, 1995) that – much like the university
outreach paradigm – posits expert organizations as one-way knowledge disseminators to
external publics (Selin and Chavez, 1995; Jamal and Getz, 1995). In placemaking, which
mirrors egalitarian values of the community engagement movement, the “local system” is
said to be “interactive,” requiring facilitated collaboration among multiple social actors
with varying, sometimes competing interests (Costa and Martinotti, 2003, p. 67).

Thus, arguments have been crafted for community persons and entities to be
involved with placemaking as a way to achieve democratic voice, to exercise civic
responsibility, and to create a sense of local authenticity in a place – from grassroots
activists to creative class elites; from struggling neighborhood associations to well-
established community development corporations; from higher education institutions
lacking some elements of programming and networking capacity to more resource-rich
research universities working to improve surrounding communities in their own
enlightened self-interest. Yet, underpinning these egalitarian arguments is an assumption
that when such a diverse cross-section of stakeholders is involved in placemaking, each
has an idea of what their needs and preferences are; that each has the knowledge,
resources, aptitude, and opportunity to express their needs and preferences within common norms of articulateness (Young, 2000). Despite efforts to cast placemaking, community-based tourism, and university-community engagement as processes that involve community members as experts, elite individuals and institutions often are responsible for creating, leading, and implementing these processes. If nothing else, they have the power to determine how “community” is defined, when and where “community” is involved, and which aspects of “community” are heard. Moscardo (2008) summarizes findings of a community engagement study conducted by Johnson and Wilson (2000):

. . . proponents of community-based decision-making processes were often naïve about existing political structures. Simple assumptions about the nature of political power meant that existing power structures were rarely challenged or changed, with the consequence that not all stakeholders were able to speak openly or with authority about their views on the proposed development options . . . community participation processes can also be dominated by external consultants, government staff and development or aid agency personnel, whose knowledge of both the proposed development and of the decision-making process gives them an advantage over the local residents. (p. 5)

While campus environments can contribute to the place identity for surrounding communities, universities also can contribute to placemaking by performing one of its essential functions: teaching. For PLGUs in particular, faculty, staff, and cooperative extension specialists can play a critical role in community-based placemaking efforts by educating local residents about technical, legal, and political aspects of planning and development processes, which ostensibly helps to fulfill PLGU public service missions as well.

Like Sandercock’s (2008) radical planner, PLGUs and perhaps other higher education institutions engaged in placemaking are, in a sense, on the horns of dilemma. By featuring or involving local communities that do not conform to acceptable norms of
articulateness, they risk losing credibility among other placemaking elites. By continuing to work in the interests of community partners (e.g., local, county, or state government entities; foundations; corporations; other universities), they maintain trust within their placemaking “profession” but risk doing a disservice to community members that may benefit tremendously from their knowledge, advocacy, and power.

Friedmann (1987) advises that maintaining “critical distance” is the best way for community-engaged experts to strike the difficult balance of being “part of the action, but not entirely a part” among a host of other “contradictions” (p. 404-5). With regard to tourism planning and development, this study observes university-based visitor information centers, conference and event services departments, and cooperative extension tourism programs as potential mechanisms in this vein. As some of them integrate community engagement concepts and language in their marketing messages, they join the fold of placemaking experts that, as Smith (2001) and Moscardo (2008) suggest, reify existing power structures through information and social capital networks despite efforts to democratize.

Due to the subtlety and even clandestine nature of these relationships, it is difficult to determine whether or not certain PLGUs are working genuinely on behalf of communities of need and hope or communities of prestige and power. It is certain, however, that some PLGUs have higher levels of programming and networking capacity than others through local and national tourism-related organizations (e.g., CVBs, National Extension Tourism Design Team, CIVSA, ACCED-I), as well as elite organizations like the AAU. Moreover, the types of tourism that certain PLGUs promote as valuable for surrounding communities provides some indication of how they are
balancing the prestige vs. public service dilemma that involvement with placemaking presents.

**Sustainable forms of tourism as placemaking.**

Definitions of sustainable tourism development can vary depending primarily on the source and the destination community within which it is being applied. For PLGUs that are involved with tourism planning and development, framing their involvement with sustainable tourism is more apt to be viewed as fulfilling their public service missions.

Casino gaming is a form of tourism that PLGUs in certain states arguably could promote – and actually do, according to a Mississippi State University phone interview respondent for this study – as a mutually beneficial community and regional development strategy. Indeed, casino gaming has proven to create jobs, its spread effects can stimulate real estate and business development, and its tax revenues often directly support public education systems. However, the numerous social ills that accompany casino gaming tourism – addiction to gambling, alcoholism, drug activity, vandalism, and personal bankruptcy, to name a few – make it a zero-sum development approach that simultaneously can revitalize and degrade a community’s built environment and social capital (Deitrick, et al., 1999). Herein, its promotion by PLGUs also could be viewed as a conflict of interest with regard to their public service mission.

Cultural heritage tourism, eco or nature-based tourism, and rural tourism are development approaches that PLGUs would be expected to promote, as these approaches generally are recognized as environmentally and culturally sustainable, whether they actually are or not. They tend to be viewed as safe, family-friendly, inclusive, and educational – all characteristics that enhance PLGUs’ public service, teaching, and
research missions and that, ultimately, support placemaking, at least on the surface. Despite these perceptions, each of these approaches carry potentially negative implications depending on how PLGUs promote them.

Cultural heritage, rural, and ecotourism issues

The National Trust for Historic Preservation defines cultural heritage tourism from a tourist-centered, experiential perspective. Accordingly, it is a form of travel in which the tourist “experience[s] the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present. It includes cultural, historic and natural resources” (2011). Heritage is complex and layered with meaning depending on social context and interpretation. Graham describes it as a set of culturally-specific meanings. These meanings take precedence over the very artifacts that represent heritage, as meaning gives value both tangibly and intangibly according to temporal and spatial contexts. Graham uses a simple East-West example to illustrate how spatial context figures into tangible and intangible conceptions of heritage:

. . . Western heritage is all too often envisaged as the [tangible] built and natural environments. Thus the list of European and North American World Heritage Sites is dominated by walled cities, cathedrals, palaces, transport artifacts and national parks. Conversely, however, heritage in Africa and Asia is often envisaged through intangible forms of traditional and popular – or folk – culture that include languages, music, dance, rituals, food and folklore (2002, p. 1004).

The post-911 U.S. has witnessed an intensification of tangible heritage meanings. For example, the World Trade Center site has become a nationalistic heritage tourism draw due to its transformation into a physical symbol of a new patriotism. This resurrected heritage of American hegemony and dominance in a globalizing economy reinforces the importance of specialization as regions seek competitive advantage. The
potential for cultural heritage tourism to contribute to regional specialization in this
case is great; 21st century renewed patriotism has signaled a rise in demand for spaces
and places that are perceived as capturing the American experience. Indeed, the
implementation of heritage policies and the management of such programs take place at
regional and local levels, such as with the National Park Service’s National Heritage
Areas program (Graham, 2002, p. 1005). American heritage appreciation practices have
been modeled by U.S. political leaders for decades through travel. President Obama’s
July 2010 family vacation to Acadia National Park in Maine was interpreted as
“‘natural’” by the White House press secretary at the time since “they so enjoyed a trip to
Yellowstone [National Park]” the previous summer (Stolberg, 2010).

Tensions based on tangible and intangible heritage values and meanings underlie
conflict in certain regions where remnants of “intangible” indigenous cultural practices
(e.g., Blues music; Native American buffalo hunting) may be upstaged, threatened,
and/or misconstrued via commodification by “tangible” forms of tourism development
(e.g., casinos; wildlife safaris). For example, Deborah and Frank Popper’s Buffalo
Commons proposal to replace agricultural land use practices and traditional growth
strategies in the Great Plains region with ecotourism has raised concerns due to
misinterpretations of environmental heritage preservation and management based on
tension between intangible-tangible heritage meanings.

"I've been accused of having a slightly un-American approach to the land and the
environment, where growth is not always the be-all and end-all, where growth can
go too far, and the Buffalo Commons implies a quietism or defeatism," Frank
Popper said. "Instead, the Buffalo Commons implies too much growth can be a
mistake, overburdening the land, overmastering the environment and in the end
always getting kicked in the rear or the pocketbook – or someplace else. . . . there
are important things to look at in how we treat this vast, characteristically
American chunk of land. There are lessons here on how to live on the land that
can be applied to the Corn Belt, the lower Mississippi Delta, and parts of our
largest cities – like Detroit – that are depopulating like the Plains. It's about sustainability. It's about being American.” (Dreiling, 2011)

Indeed, for over twenty years, the Poppers have argued for “more buffalo and fewer cattle, more environmental protection and less extraction, and more ecotourism and less emphasis on conventional rural development . . . because it draws on the most evocative parts of the [Great Plains] region’s past” (Popper and Popper, 2006). Yet, the region’s past may be viewed by some as not tangible (read: Western or American) enough which opens the proverbial door to forms of so-called ecotourism – such as custom “wildlife” tours in private planes and group “backcountry jeep safaris” (Save Eco Destinations, 2009) – that may not be genuinely eco-friendly or respectful of original, indigenous forms of “intangible” heritage in the long run.

Rural tourism is a form of heritage preservation and/or celebration that, in a global high tech society, is fueled by nostalgia for times and places that once were. This has led to what is viewed as sustainable repurposing of farms for entertainment, which can be quite a lucrative income diversification strategy for agri-businesses. As this study reports, agritourism has become a salient aspect of PLGU cooperative extension tourism services. Yet, much like ecotourism, rural tourism has been critiqued for inducing more development rather than less. As Essex observes:

. . . many rural in-migrants are interested in processes of agriculture, fishing, and forestry as well as rural land management for open-space or ecological conservation, yet access to these productive processes is obstructed by cultural norms and narratives of consumption and preservation. By engaging in rural living as a form of residential tourism, and by succumbing to consumerized forms of leisure environmentalism, many genuinely well-intentioned migrants end up damaging both environmental quality and the prospect of a future rural landscape of the sort in which they wish to live. (2005, p. 8)
Arguably, this criticism applies not only to “residential” tourists, but incidental tourists as well who are visiting rural regions like the Great Plains and the Mississippi Delta12 more frequently. An increased reliance in these regions on so-called sustainable forms of “tourism rather than agriculture will require an acute balance between wildlife and people” and – as the Poppers suggest in their “Permanent Issue of Euroamerican Plains land history” concept – between use and preservation of land and of culture (Popper and Popper, 2006).

Because heritage knowledge and meanings are subjective, diverse, and even discordant within temporal and spatial contexts, issues arise with regard to who owns the heritage, who defines it, and who benefits from it within localities. This inherent “dissonance” within heritage, as Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) have it, emanates from the use of heritage as a knowledge commodity that is consumed and interpreted simultaneously by tourists and locals for different and sometimes conflicting reasons. Moreover, this dissonance is underpinned by zero-sum characteristics; that is to say, the “creation of any heritage actively or potentially disinherit or excludes those who do not subscribe to, or are not embraced within, the terms of meaning attending that heritage” (Graham, 2002, p. 1005). The inherent dissonance within heritage is simultaneously a point of leverage and contention, a delicate balance that must be managed effectively, particularly for rural and culturally rich yet historically impoverished and/or depopulating

12 For geographic context, according to the Center for Great Plains Studies at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln, there are 10 states that are included in the Great Plains region: Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming (see http://www.unl.edu/plains/publications/atlas.shtml). The Delta Regional Authority, a federal economic development entity established to improve quality of life of Delta residents, serves counties and parishes in the following eight states: Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee (see http://www.dra.gov/about-us/eight-state-map.aspx). Both websites accessed on July 16, 2011.
regions like the Mississippi Delta and the Great Plains (Popper 2008) that could adopt this strategy comprehensively in light of what appears to be an enduring post-911 American patriotism.

*     *     *     *     *     *

**Research question 2: How is PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development justified as a mission-driven activity?**

*Guiding hypothesis:* PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development is marketed by PLGUs as a mission-driven form of public service that emphasizes three placemaking-oriented tourism approaches: cultural heritage tourism, ecotourism, and rural tourism.

**III. Issues of place-based approaches to tourism: Collaboration, power conflict, place competitiveness, and destination image**

Three interrelated themes of tourism placemaking – collaboration and power conflicts; destination image development; and place competitiveness – are understood as critical components of university-community tourism planning and development.

**Collaboration and power conflict in tourism placemaking.**

With placemaking as the emergent framework for tourism, collaboration and partnerships also have emerged as issues in tourism planning and development research, with particular emphasis on documenting and evaluating collaborative planning processes in local and regional development contexts. Indeed, the fragmented nature of the tourism meta-industry provides a substantive rationale for collaboration (Hall, 2000; Roberts and Simpson, 1999) among different stakeholders with diverse and sometimes competing
interests in the tourism planning process, which brings issues of power relations and conflict to the fore (Ladkin and Bertramini, 2002).

Gray’s (1989) seminal collaboration framework figures quite prominently in the tourism planning literature, with several studies linking the framework to community-based tourism development case studies (see, for example, Jamal and Getz, 1995; Reed, 1997; Selin and Beason, 1991; Selin and Chavez, 1995). Gray identifies three phases of collaboration and partnership development: (1) problem-setting, (2) direction-setting and (3) implementing/institutionalizing. While the implementing/institutionalizing phase has been judged to be a weakness in tourism development and management and, therefore, worthy of increased research emphasis (Jamal and Stronza, 2009), the problem-setting phase generally is viewed as the most critical for ensuring successful planning outcomes (Healey, 1997).

Stakeholder identification, involvement, and legitimization are essential to the problem-setting phase, as “failure to include them in the design stage only invites technical or political difficulties during implementation.” Based on Gray’s definition of stakeholders as individuals, groups, or organizations “directly influenced by the actions others take to solve a problem” (Gray, 1989, p. 65), tourism stakeholders in particular have been defined broadly as anyone in a community or region who is impacted by tourism development positively or negatively. As the present research aims to demonstrate, universities not only are impacted by tourism planning and development but also advance tourism mechanisms that contribute to placemaking.

To underscore further the critical importance of stakeholder management early in the planning process, it is suggested that broad-based community-level input in shaping tourism development helps to reduce potential conflict (Aas, Ladkin, and Fletcher, 2005).
Conflict between tourists and the destination community is a primary concern in more established destinations, particularly as visitation increases over time. Community stakeholder involvement can help to prepare destinations to respond to this and other forms of externally-derived conflict.

However, in emerging destinations – like Newark, NJ, and the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area – external sources of conflict are less of a concern when compared to conflicts that can occur between and among stakeholders during early stages of the planning process. Interests tend not to be collectively organized in emerging destinations, thus making the identification of legitimate stakeholders a complicated and risky step in the planning process (Bramwell and Sharman, 1999; Reed, 1997; Tosun, 2000). The process by which stakeholders are identified, legitimized, and involved surely can result in initial conflicts, particularly if certain stakeholders are viewed as being excluded from the planning process.

With regard to power, Gray (1989) contends that shared access to power is necessary during the first collaborative planning phase, and that sufficient – but not necessarily equal – distribution of power is necessary during the second phase. Throughout the planning process, joint or consensus-based decision-making is critical (Jamal and Stronza, 2009; Reed, 1997). In an interorganizational tourism planning effort, collaboration can take on a variety of forms. As Gray suggests, particularly in emerging tourism destinations, financial and expert resources may be limited to the point that decision-making powers are shared among members of a centralized planning group representing multiple partner entities, especially in the initial planning phases when primary and secondary stakeholders are supposed to be identified and vetted.
As with the communicative-collaborative paradigm in planning theory, a major criticism of collaborative tourism planning is its assumption that simply by involving all stakeholders, power imbalances can be overcome, thus ignoring fundamental constraints of power distribution and resource allocation (Healey, 1997; Reed, 1997). Collaborative tourism planning as an approach also has several drawbacks related to stakeholder management and power relations: the challenge of assessing and building stakeholders’ capacity to participate (Araujo and Bramwell, 1999; Reed, 2000; Reed, 1997); uncertain costs due to time protraction in the deliberative process (Marien and Pizam, 1997; Swarbrooke, 1999); and the difficulty of balancing power between those who have been privileged to define and/or control norms of articulateness, which tend to be local elites, and those whose opinions (e.g., silent majority and any local minorities) usually may be superseded or unheard as a result (Arnstein, 1969; Hall, 2000; Tosun, 2000; Young 2000).

**Destination image development in tourism placemaking.**

Placemaking as a framework for tourism planning has implications for destination image development as well.

. . . [P]erhaps the most important criterion for selecting to visit or not to visit a destination is its *image*. Image is the set of expectations and perceptions a prospective traveller has of a destination. Past experience of the destination or the companies involved (i.e., airlines, hotels, tour operators); descriptions by friends and relatives; general information; and marketing campaigns develop these expectations and perception which may be true or imaginary representations. . . . Developing the right image for destinations will therefore determine their ability to satisfy visitors. . . (Buhalis, 2000, p. 101)

Destination image is key in the placemaking framework. Cultural heritage tourists are among the most highly sought after segment of place consumers, as they tend to be more affluent and, therefore, spend more, stay longer, and are loyal to destinations where they
have had positive experiences. Such tourists tend to rate a destination based on how they perceive it as authentic and educational. Whereas the mass tourist has been critiqued as a “gullible observer” duped into believing that staged, illusory attractions within the tourist bubble are authentic place products (Urry, 2002, p.7), the more sophisticated, critical, knowledgeable, and self-reflexive cultural heritage tourist tends to understand and exercise the variety of choices and roles available to him throughout a destination area.

Thus, within placemaking, a destination is understood as a “perceptual concept, which can be interpreted subjectively by consumers, depending on their travel itinerary, cultural background, purpose of visit, educational level and past experience” (Buhalis, 2000, p. 97). As an amalgam of tangible (e.g., hotels, visitor attractions, transportation) and intangible (e.g., image, culture) tourism product offerings that can be interpreted in multiple ways by multiple types of tourists, destinations in the placemaking framework should be planned and managed with diverse consumer perspectives, interests, and educational levels in mind (Palmer and Bejou, 1995). An additional challenge to tourism planners and managers is meeting demands of place-product specialization in a competitive destination hierarchy.

The conference and event services aspect of university-community tourism planning and development has particular relevance here. Universities historically and consistently have demonstrated the capacity to host visitors, to draw media attention, and to generate economic activity through major sporting events ranging from the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta – a one-time mega event that encompassed a number of university-based venues throughout the city and the region including Georgia State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, the Atlanta University Center and the University of Georgia in Athens (Ruthheiser, 1996) – to collegiate bowls and historically
black college and university football classics and homecoming celebrations that take place annually throughout the U.S.

Universities also develop heritage and create traditions by hosting, jointly sponsoring, and/or being associated with significant cultural events. The 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition, among the most famous in the history of World’s Fairs, attracted hundreds of thousands of visitors to Chicago; over a century later, this mega event continues to be studied and remains a salient feature in the University of Chicago’s physical and social landscape a la the Midway Plaisance (UChicagoNews, 2008). Higher education institutions also are known for sponsoring local music events and festivals that are veritable institutions themselves, as their enduring popularity and staying power attest. The Atlanta University Center’s Morehouse Spelman Christmas Carol Concert and The University of Chicago Folk Festival, which have been in existence for 87 years and 52 years, respectively, are examples.

Localization trends in tourism planning suggest that community-based events will play a more integral role in creating and reinforcing destination image. As cities and regions attempt to appear or feel authentic in a globalizing marketplace of reproducible tourist landscapes, the staging of unique local events emerges as a critical branding and marketing strategy for destinations (Fainstein, Hoffman, and Judd, 2003). From this perspective, the variety of events that universities host, plan, and attract may contribute to destination image development.

There is debate in the tourism planning tourism literature, however, regarding the destination image creation power of mega and hallmark events like the Olympics or the World’s Fair versus smaller, community-based events. Getz (2007) distinguishes among mega events, hallmark events, and community-based events thusly:
Mega events are typically global in their orientation and require a competitive bid to ‘win’ them as a one-time event for a particular place. By contrast, ‘hallmark events’ cannot exist independently of their host community, and ‘local’ or ‘regional’ events are by definition rooted in one place and appeal mostly to residents. (p. 408)

Indeed, Holcomb’s (1999) analysis of destination image creation suggests that international mega-events like the Olympics and the World’s Fair are most worthy of consideration, whereas “less conspicuous,” “more frequent” local, regional, and national events (e.g., ethnic and cultural festivals, sports events) do not have as much to contribute to destination image as they are likely to attract only “temporary visitors” (p. 61).

Likewise, Hall maintains that mega- and hallmark events are the destination “image builders of modern tourism.” (Hall, 1992, p. 1). However, Mules finds that Hall’s perspective “discounts the regional” and “large annual national events from consideration because they are not ‘unique’” (p. 197). Getz observes that this long-term, ongoing debate over an event hierarchy causes some destinations “to over-emphasize mega events to the detriment of a more balance portfolio, while others pursue the promotion of one or more events as destination hallmarks” in order to “institutionalize” them as part of branding the destination (2008, pp. 407-408).

Yet, community planning and action have played powerful roles in reimaging destinations. Before, during, and after the 1992 Olympic Games, the “social cohesion” approach figured prominently in Barcelona’s recasting as a “dynamic” landscape of increased public space and a harmonious blend of historic and contemporary uses. Local street fairs and cultural events associated with the Games played important roles in promoting the city’s new image of “local patriotism and civic pride” and fit into a well-coordinated marketing plan that focused on local heritage (Garcia and Claver, 2003, pp. 117, 118). Although Barcelona incurred a $1.4 billion public debt while other Olympic
cities like Los Angeles, Seoul, and Atlanta profited (Holcomb, 1999, p. 60), the long-term benefits of a collaborative, sustainable destination image perhaps has offset the debt by now: tourism activity in Barcelona is said to have increased about 10 percent each year between 1994 and 2003. The Olympic Games indeed was the catalyst for Barcelona’s transformation from a declining city to a postmodern international tourist destination; however, the role that local participation and events played in the process cannot be ignored (Garcia and Claver, 2003).

Hall’s edict resonates: hallmark events are the image builders of modern tourism. The suggested primacy of such events perhaps is better understood within a mass tourism framework in which urban places are juxtaposed with sun-and-sea destinations and are obliged to devise ways to completely recast themselves as desirable, safe, and fun in order to gain comparative advantage. It makes sense, then, that mega-events like the Olympics, the World’s Fair, and the Soccer World Cup represent major opportunities for cities to reimage themselves in this way. Further, as a nod to enduring positivism, cities (like Kuhnian paradigms) are obliged to compete with each other in order to be crowned the singular model of mass urban tourism until it is replaced by another two to four years later.

Conversely, in the placemaking framework, competitive advantage has become the goal for destinations. In particular, destination image has been cited as a key benefit to communities and regions that can help to ensure return visits from tourists (Holcomb, 1999), as well as to attract new business development and creative class residents (Florida, 2002). Thus, placemakers are recognizing power in local action and in building civic participation and pride. In a postmodern marketplace of diverse demands, tourism planners theoretically can harness this power by strategically attracting and/or creating an
array of hallmark events that are supplemented by thematically-integrated community events.

According to Getz, “all types of planned events have tourism potential, even the smallest wedding or reunion” (2008, p. 411). The gradual inculcation of postmodern tourism planning models and practices signals the need to reexamine how local events are treated as creators of and contributors to destination image. Conferences and events staged through university-community tourism mechanisms is explored as a destination image development strategy. As the Rutgers case study demonstrates in chapter 4, however, this two-way activity can have positive and negative implications for both universities and surrounding communities.

**Place competitiveness in tourism placemaking.**

Events are not the only source of destination competitiveness in the placemaking framework. Weerts and Sandmann suggest that engaged universities are learning organizations (2007), which are “organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together” (Senge, 1990, p. 3). The development of learning organizations and learning regions is a well known and richly debated place competitiveness strategy in the ever-changing knowledge economy (Garvin, Edmondson, and Gino, 2008; Hassink, 2005; Hudson, 1999; Macleod and Goodwin, 1999). Amin (1999) observes that in the 21st century,

. . . learning [i]s a key factor in dynamic competitiveness. Indeed, it is claimed that economically successful regions are 'learning' or 'intelligent' regions. It is their capacity to adapt around particular sectors and to anticipate at an early stage
new industrial and commercial opportunities that enables them to develop and retain competitive advantage around a range of existing and future possibilities. Their strength lies in 'learning to learn'. (p. 371)

From this regional institutionalist perspective, knowledge-intensive or learning organizations are the building blocks of learning regions with knowledge leaders and workers as the driving force behind cultures, structures, products, and services that create conditions for regional competitiveness and economic prosperity through collaboration (Florida, 2008; Florida, 1995). Leaders within learning organizations are assumed to have mastered systems-level thinking, an awareness of connectivity among actors and organizations (Senge, 2006), which is critical to collaboration in tourism destination communities.

Saxena (2005) draws connections between interorganizational tourism communities and learning regions with the potential to develop collaborative competitive advantage from the benefits of successful partnering, collective learning, local knowledge codification, and social capital development. With regard to place competitiveness, social and educational exchanges through institutionally thick knowledge networks can help to create and sustain destination image and sense of place which play key roles in a region’s ability to attract industry, visitors, and potential residents (Ihlanfeldt, 1995). Social connections can lead to economic exchanges through agglomeration or industry clusters which can support economic prosperity in the form of innovation, business development, and job creation (Morgan, 1997).

Engagement is viewed as a two-way process; herein, both universities and community-based entities are assumed to have the capacity to work with each other. For community-based entities to engage effectively with universities, the ability to adapt and
to learn quickly is critical (Gowdy, et al., 2009). In order for community-level entities to collaborate effectively with higher education institutions in the knowledge economy and “to participate on equal footing, they need to be well-organized and bring to the table not only local knowledge, connections, and a vision for the future, but also the capacity to get things done” (Fox, Truehaft, and Douglass, 2006, p. 69). As discussed previously, universities have been and likely will continue to be a resource to local restaurants, small retailers, nonprofits, and neighborhood residents in developing such capacity; however, this perspective places an imperative on leaders of community-based organizations to create organizational cultures and structures that produce expert-level outcomes that match the collective needs and interests of stakeholders. This assumes a leader’s capacity for transformational, adaptive leadership which may or may not be learned and applied quickly, as most organizational cultures are slow and resistant to change (Heifetz and Linsky, 2002; Sashkin and Sashkin, 2003; Selin and Chavez, 1995). This applies to small business owners who may be working with cooperative extension tourism educators on planning festival events or agritourism development in their localities.

The learning region and learning organization competitiveness scheme is critiqued on various points, chief among them the criticism that knowledge production as power is nothing new in capitalist economies; that collaborative knowledge networks are based more on influence than trust, thus allowing existing power differentials among stakeholders to persist; and that regional actors who historically have controlled knowledge production (e.g., definitions of heritage that shape destination image and sense of place) are unlikely to share that power with workers or with other groups that are not viewed as adding potential economic value. Thus,
[a]s a consequence, uneven development within and between regions and their constituent social groups is unavoidable. Knowledge and learning may be necessary for economic success but they are by no means sufficient to ensure it . . . [or] to ensure equality, cohesion and social justice (Hudson, 1999, p. 69).

In particular, for developing, emerging, or so-called less fortunate/favored regions, the strategy is difficult to implement as “a very large number of less favoured regions suffer from the problem of industrial and institutional lock-in and that of reactive adaptation to their economic environment, thus preventing the formation of a learning culture” (Amin, 1999, p. 371).

Still, this study maintains that engaged universities as learning organizations can help to develop the competitiveness (i.e., capacity) of tourism destinations by fostering education and training. Assuming that universities and community entities are engaged and view it in their collective interest, tourism destinations may realize some potential benefits of a learning region development strategy.

*     *     *

To summarize, the emerging placemaking framework within tourism poses a nexus of opportunities and challenges for university-community tourism planning and development. Universities and surrounding communities that have the mutual capacity to knowledgeably and respectfully collaborate in tourism placemaking efforts potentially face conflicts based on past and/or existing town-gown power differentials. Power can shape the types of placemaking strategies that are pursued and implemented for a destination community. In an engagement context, destination image development strategies like local and regional festival events can affect all stakeholders with reciprocal positive or negative returns, at least theoretically. However, elite institutions like universities and powerful local counterparts likely possess expert, financial, and social
capital resources that provide them with options to shield themselves from responsibilities and risks of tourism planning and development through nonparticipation and/or to maximize its benefits in ways that less powerful entities may not be capable of doing. Both the Rutgers University and Alcorn State University case studies provide insights regarding complex, regionally-based institutional webs of relationships, occurrences, and perceptions that characterize university-community tourism planning and development activity. The third research question and guiding hypothesis aim to clarify these aspects of PLGU tourism planning and development.

**Research question 3: What are reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development? Do benefits and drawbacks differ based on institutional capacity levels?**

*Guiding hypothesis: Reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development are rooted in concepts of placemaking which include community collaboration or community power conflict; enhanced or inhibited place competitiveness; and positive or negative destination image formation. Because higher capacity level PLGUs are more involved in placemaking efforts in their communities, they are more likely to experience reciprocal benefits and drawbacks than PLGUs at lower capacity levels.*

**IV. PLGUs and tourism planning and development: an engagement in the (place) making?**

Connell argues that universities can fulfill at least the public service and education aspects of their missions by making event, housing, and hospitality services and facilities available for public (i.e., taxpayer) accommodation at competitive prices, thereby
generating “extra revenue” that can “become incorporated into general institutional funds” to support “mainstream educational use” and “less wealthy students.” Moreover, Connell argues that through campus-based tourism programs, universities have the opportunity to act in a socially responsible way by providing cheaply priced holidays to sections of society who are in some way economically disadvantaged. Prices charged could be designed to cover costs with any profit being directed to a specific fund for disadvantaged students. (2000, p. 8)

While Connell’s vision may be commendable from a standpoint of public access and engagement, in a time of state and federal government budget cuts, shrinking resources, and increasing higher education costs, it also may be problematic. Indeed, as a result of budget shortfalls, universities are becoming more entrepreneurial (Bok, 2003; Stein, 2004). Yet, entrepreneurial activities like conference and event management may be viewed as taking universities away from their core missions of teaching and research.

In addition, by offering event and conference spaces, lodging, and other hospitality services at lower costs to visitors, universities also may undercut surrounding hotels, restaurants, and small catering businesses. Unless universities engage such local businesses in cooperative marketing and/or supplier diversity partnerships that refer customers out or that bring local businesses to their campuses to work with meetings and events, town-gown relations can become exacerbated. Such is the tension that characterizes some aspects of university involvement in tourism.

*     *     *

Figure 6 is a proposed theoretical map locating the present research among overlapping paradigms in the urban planning, tourism planning, and higher education public service literatures. This study integrates concepts from these three areas towards
understanding PLGU involvement in tourism planning and development as a form of community-engaged placemaking.

As Figure 6 illustrates, I observe that university-community tourism engagement should be understood *theoretically* as a constructivist phenomenon. I stress the term theoretically because, as this study demonstrates, in practice, university-community tourism engagement as a dynamic, emerging phenomenon is yet influenced by outreach ideology. Herein, the diagram also sets forth a vision of where university-community tourism engagement research and practice could (or should) be directed in the future. The theoretical map also provides a set of overlapping concepts through which further research in this area may be initiated.
Figure 6. Proposed theoretical mapping of university-community tourism planning and development.
Chapter III: National Overview of

Public Land-Grant University Tourism Planning and Development

In order to assess the extent to which PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development is a form of community engagement, it is important to provide a socio-historical context for the phenomenon. It also is important to document where this phenomenon is taking place. As discussed previously, there is a resurgence of interest in the public service missions of universities in the U.S., particularly now as they are being called upon increasingly to become more accountable to external constituencies by demonstrating their contributions to broader society. As the two previous chapters suggest, there are several viable means by which universities and communities engage for mutual benefit. Is tourism planning and development among them?

This chapter provides the results of a national inventory and analysis of PLGU tourism planning and development capacity. First, it places the phenomenon in a historical land-grant public service context. The chapter then develops a national picture of the activity, with a particular focus on the tourism planning and development mechanisms within PLGUs, as well as similar features and activities at comparable private and public non-land-grant research universities in the U.S.

The chapter begins with a brief historical overview of PLGUs and other research universities in the U.S. I then present the capacity inventory based on documented tourism planning and development mechanisms and enhancements (e.g., external partnerships and organizational affiliations). Next, based on a visual analysis of PLGU websites, I demonstrate how PLGUs communicate advancement of a community-engaged public service mission by linking cooperative extension tourism, academic programs in tourism and allied fields (e.g., hospitality and hotel management, leisure
studies, recreation), conference and event services, and campus-based visitor information centers with cultural heritage tourism, ecotourism, and rural tourism. Finally, I draw some conclusions based on comparisons among PLGUs and other universities that were analyzed for tourism planning and development capacity.

A brief history of PLGUs in U.S. higher education

“For the good of the masses”: PLGUs, public service, and Progressive spirit.

PLGUs are perceived simultaneously as beneficiaries, proponents, and partially ambivalent inheritors of a public trust building and negotiation process that traces back to the passing of the Morrill Act of 1862. The Morrill Act provided grants of federal lands to states for broader establishment of public universities and colleges. These federally-mandated and state-supported higher education institutions were created to educate the so-called industrial classes in practical and applied fields such as agriculture and mechanical arts, as well as to make some of the vast public lands given away by the federal government to corporations and railroads “available for the good of the masses” (Maurrasse, 2001, p. 17). Whereas U.S. colonial colleges in previous decades primarily had been exclusive social preserves of the nation’s elite – evocative of the cloistered ivory tower image of higher education institutions that endures in the American psyche to this day – the Morrill Act helped to broaden access to higher education opportunity of a more practical sort for the many who were admitted. Figure 7 illustrates the geographic breadth of this mandate for educational access and public service. At the time, however, blacks, Native Americans, and women were not included.
Roughly three decades later, as part of the second Morrill Act of 1890, states were given land grants and funds “to establish state universities for persons of color if race was an admissions factor at the existing state university” (APLU, 2011). These 1890 universities, as they came to be known and still are referred to generally today, broadened higher education access to a largely impoverished black population yet recovering from the dehumanizing ravages of slavery through formal training in agriculture, mechanical, and sometimes normal (i.e., teacher preparation) arts. As Figure 8 illustrates, the 1890 schools are located in former slave states throughout the southern U.S. Much like their white counterparts – though significantly less resource rich due to a pervasive separate
and unequal philosophy of education – these institutions, 18 in all, were mandated to serve the black masses with regard to both education and service (Maurrasse, 2001; McDowell, 2001; Rhodes, 2001).

Some free blacks and black elites with white ancestry – a minority within the nation’s African-American populace – attended primarily small, private black-only liberal arts/teacher colleges in the South and, in some rare instances, even gained entrance to a few white private colleges and universities in the North like Williams, Oberlin, Harvard, and Yale (Gatewood, 1993). The widely accepted private-as-exclusive and public-as-inclusive dichotomy which transcends racial lines in higher education cultures is rooted in these historical patterns, at least in part. Arguably, this dichotomy

![Figure 8. Map of 1890 land-grant universities in the 50 United States](http://www.nifa.usda.gov/qlinks/partners/state_partners.html#maps)
has helped to reinforce the idea that public colleges and universities are held to greater expectations than their private counterparts with regard to roles and responsibilities in public service and educational access (Rhodes, 2001).

The establishment of the 1890 schools coincided with the advent of the Progressive Era, during which time the culture of university outreach to communities ignited by the Morrill Act made vigorous advancements. The Wisconsin Idea, introduced in a 1904 speech by then University of Wisconsin President Charles Van Hise, propelled public service efforts to ensure “the beneficent influence of the University reach[e]d every home in the state” of Wisconsin. Supported by Van Hise’s vision, university faculty used their expertise to help guide state legislative advisory boards, gaining Wisconsin a national reputation for innovative governance (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2006). Demand for university involvement with public service grew in other states as a result, which led to the passing of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, a law that established PLGU extension services to farmers and entire communities in need of expertise in traditional farming applications such as crop production, pest control, and animal agriculture, as well as home economics applications such as nutrition, canning, and sewing. The federal government provided half of the resources, while the other half was provided by state, county, and local entities, thus warranting the term “cooperative” extension (McDowell, 2001).

The model of the American university – with its tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service – is said to have taken full form in the Progressive Era as a hybrid of three higher education influences: (1) mid-nineteenth century U.S.-based, teaching-centered liberal arts institutions; (2) German and other European universities which
placed great emphasis on highly specialized scholarly inquiry (i.e., research); and (3) public service and outreach in the form of cooperative extension for public land-grant institutions and in the form of social service research projects for private universities, such as the Progressive Era settlement houses of Northwestern University and The University of Chicago (Maurrause, 2001). The fact that cooperative extension services targeted primarily agrarian constituencies highlights a rural-urban dichotomy that has shaped the perception of public service at both public land-grant and private universities.

For private universities located in rapidly growing urban communities, public service was promoted as a philosophically democratic ideal, a means for university experts to reform the ills of society through purposeful intervention (Foglesong 1986). Both John Dewey and former University of Chicago president William Rainey Harper proclaimed research universities as “prophets of democracy” (Benson, et al., as quoted in Maurrause, 2001, p. 19). Perhaps because private universities were not publicly mandated to provide specific assistance in applied and practical fields like agriculture, the forms and vehicles of service that they provided – such as Dewey’s philosophical affiliations with Jane Addams’ Hull House (Hamington, 2010) – took on a comparatively intellectual tone.

The period from 1920 to the end of World War II marks the “Transition to Science” era of American agriculture, and university agricultural research and extension services figured prominently in advancements that took place during that time (Huffman and Evenson, 1993). This era paved the way for the so-called “Entrepreneurial University,” a model that took form around the end of World War II and expanded considerably through the end of the Cold War era in the late-1980s (Benson and Harkavy,
The Entrepreneurial University era prioritized research and teaching in response to two primary forces: (1) institutional emphasis on securing federal funds that supported research on globally expanding the nation’s economic and defense interests and (2) increased racial, socioeconomic, gender, and age diversity among university student bodies due to the return of war veterans and the Civil Rights Movement. This period is said to mark the halcyon days of PLGU agricultural research and extension services as well. U.S. farmers competed successfully with producers throughout the world and the agricultural sector became one of the most productive sectors of the U.S. economy (Huffman and Evenson, 1993).

**Elite allure: corporate-sponsored research and prestige marketing.**

The tremendous scientific advancements and significant economic success of PLGU agricultural extension eventually resulted in a larger, more productive and sophisticated corporate-oriented agricultural sector given to constant innovation. Those farmers whose small operations could not keep up either were bought out or squeezed out altogether due to obsolescence. Public service and outreach became less of a priority for many of the so-called flagship PLGUs as faculty expertise and institutional resources became increasingly dedicated to advancing corporate-sponsored research agendas. In recent years, scholars have used a variety of labels to encapsulate systemic effects of the Entrepreneurial University era, including commercialization, commodification, vocationalization, and corporatization of higher education (Giroux, 2001; Stein, 2004)

According to Derek Bok, former president of Harvard,

Commercialization turns out to have multiple causes. Financial cutbacks undoubtedly acted as a spur to profit-seeking for some universities and some departments. The spirit of private enterprise and entrepreneurship that became so prominent in the 1980s helped encourage and legitimate such initiatives. A lack of
clarity about academic values opened the door even wider. Keener competition gave still further impetus. But none of these stimuli would have borne such abundant fruit had it not been for the rapid growth of money-making opportunities provided by a more technologically sophisticated, knowledge-based economy. . . . corporate investments in academic science have yielded a handsome return in new products and improved technology. As a result, companies have increased their support, relieving the government of some of the burden of funding university research. (2003, p.15)

As the Entrepreneurial University model reached its peak in the 1980s and 1990s, support for agricultural extension began to come under assault at both state and federal levels. In particular, the place of cooperative extension as an applied research venture increasingly became a questionable investment and, some maintain, still is. McDowell (2001) explains that

[t]he reason is quite simple and clear. The success of the agricultural research/extension establishment and the increased productive capacity of farmers made it possible to produce the nation’s food with ever fewer farmers. Indeed, as more successful farmers survive and less successful farmers go out of business, farm business size has grown and farm numbers have declined. In 1997 with 2.05 million farms, there were almost 400,000 fewer farms (16 percent decline) than in 1977. But the extension portfolio of programs has not followed suit. Indeed during the same period, the proportion of extension resources committed to agricultural programs has grown rather than shifted toward new clients and new problems (p. 9)

The “new problems” that McDowell mentions suggest the nation’s shift from an agrarian-based economy to a service-, information-based economy. In an effort to diversify expertise portfolios in response to changing economic structures in rural communities, in the mid-1990s, the Communities in Economic Transition Initiative identified four new extension service tracks including value-added manufacturing, home-based business, retail development, and recreation/tourism (McAlister, Teater, and Pope, 1993). This brought about cooperative extension tourism, which has a very strong presence in a few of the PLGUs and a minimal to non-existent presence at others.
Despite such attempts to transition PLGU public service into rapidly proliferating service-based economies – and, perhaps, refurbish it as a more viable competitor in a 21st century commercialized higher education landscape – critics maintain that by the mid-1990s, PLGUs already had relinquished much of the public service aspect of their social contract with American society to other institutions, such as community colleges. In addition, widely recognized flagship campuses of state PLGU systems had begun to distinguish themselves as more elite than satellite campuses in other locales within their respective states (McDowell, 2001; Weerts and Sandmann, 2008). This elitism established an enduring pecking order that characterizes the in-state cultures of PLGU systems even today.

An illustrative example is recent controversy surrounding the impending separation of the University of Wisconsin-Madison from the rest of the state university system due to state budget woes. Listed among the world’s top 25 highly reputed universities by Times Higher Education in 2011, UW-Madison is a founding member of the AAU. The “UW-Madison and the State Budget” website (http://budget.wisc.edu/) provides a copious list of frequently asked questions from webchats and campus forums about its plans for assuming independent public authority under its New Badger Partnership plan. Though UW-Madison reiterates its commitment to public service and continued collaboration with the state university system, the website documents a litany of recurring concerns including whether or not the Madison campus will remain public, if it will remain committed to its historic land-grant public service mission, and how its separation could adversely impact “satellite” campuses through increased competition for state resources and for the best students and employees.
National hierarchies among PLGUs persist as well and not simply based on annual academic rankings by the likes of Times Higher Education and U.S. News and World Report. Similar to UW-Madison, other public land-grant institutions distinguish themselves as elite by touting their membership in the AAU, of which nearly one-third (20) are PLGUs.

For example, the University of Arizona’s “Highlights & Rankings” webpage cites the institution as:

one of 63 [sic] leading public and private research universities in the United States and Canada and the only AAU member in Arizona. Membership in AAU is by invitation and is based on the high quality of programs of academic research and scholarship and undergraduate, graduate, and professional education, as well as general recognition that a university is outstanding by reason of the excellence of its research and education programs.\textsuperscript{13}

Rutgers University, “the only public university in New Jersey in the Association of American Universities,” distinguishes itself as “the sole university in the United States that is a colonial college, a land-grant institution, and a public university.”\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, AAU membership is difficult to attain. With “a reputation as a private club,” in 2010, the AAU invited its first new member institution in over a decade: Georgia Institute of Technology, a public university located in Atlanta. Perhaps in an effort to prove membership is not based on subjective criteria like reputation and prestige, in April 2011, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, a PLGU and member institution for over 102 years, was voted out of the AAU for falling short of research funding expectations set forth by the organization. Syracuse University, under similar scrutiny, left the AAU voluntarily in May 2011.

\textsuperscript{13} See University of Arizona “Highlights and Rankings,” paragraph 3, retrieved from http://www.arizona.edu/about/highlights-rankings, accessed June 1, 2011

\textsuperscript{14} See Rutgers University “Who We Are: The Only 1” webpage, retrieved from http://www.rutgers.edu/about-rutgers/who-we-are, accessed June 1, 2011.
It's not clear what prompted the special reviews of Nebraska and Syracuse last year, except that they ranked at the bottom of the AAU metrics.

What particularly hurt Nebraska in those metrics is that as a land-grant institution in a farming state, it gets a large share of its research dollars for agriculture. The entire University of Nebraska system had $13.2-million in federally financed farm-related research in 2008, or about 10 percent of its total federal research dollars, as compared with a nationwide average of about 3 percent.

The AAU, however, does not give such research the same weight in its membership criteria because much of federal support for agricultural work is awarded through formulas and earmarks rather than peer-reviewed grants. As a result, presidents of land-grant institutions say that the AAU metrics are stacked against them (Selingo and Stripling, 2011).

So, it appears that PLGUs may be at a considerable disadvantage with regard to maintaining the old guard prestige of AAU membership. Agricultural research, the very foundation of their existence, is not wholly recognized as part of the profile of a leading research university, at least not by the AAU. This may help to explain, at least in part, why PLGU flagships are perceived as steadily abandoning their social contract with surrounding communities (i.e., agricultural cooperative extension) in favor of distinguishing themselves as elite institutions that are competitive for non-agricultural federal research grants, as well corporate-sponsored research funds.

Rutgers and a few other PLGUs including Penn State University\(^{15}\) and the University of Florida-Gainesville\(^{16}\) have mentioned “Public Ivy” status at one time or another in their promotional materials. Moll (1985) was the first to distinguish eight so-called “Public Ivies” and nine “Public Ivy” runners-up towards identifying state-supported higher education institutions of academic quality, heritage, and aesthetics.

\(^{15}\) See Penn State’s Department of Political Science “About the University and Community: The University” webpage, paragraph 1, retrieved from http://polisci.la.psu.edu/graduate/university_and_community.html, accessed June 1, 2001.

\(^{16}\) See “University of Florida History” on its College of Fine Arts homepage, retrieved from http://www.arts.ufl.edu/welcome/history.aspx, accessed June 1, 2011.
comparable to the Ivy League. Greene (2001) later expanded the list by according 30 public colleges and universities with “Public Ivy” status, 13 of which are PLGUs.

Table 3 provides a list of 59 AAU-member institutions in the U.S. (the two Canadian institutions – McGill University and University of Toronto – are not within the scope of this study) and indicates Ivy League institutions along with Greene’s “Public Ivies.” By overlapping the AAU member list and Greene’s “Public Ivy” designations, it becomes clear which campus locales within PLGU systems are considered epicenters of institutional prestige and power. Such institutional differentiation mechanisms can reinforce the perception that certain PLGUs are disengaged from communities that they originally had been mandated to serve. They also can create confusion and a culture of divisiveness within PLGU campus systems. For example, in 2004, Rutgers’ flagship campus in New Brunswick launched a “Public Ivy” promotional campaign. Subsequently, a faculty council meeting on the university’s Newark campus was convened under the aegis of a “Branding Project” with

state-wide surveys indicat[ing] that the public does not view Rutgers as favorably as would be desired. . . . there will be one general ‘branding’ proposal for the University as well as individual proposals for each of the campuses. The recent media ads of Rutgers-New Brunswick as a “public ivy” was independently promoted by the Rutgers-New Brunswick Admissions office, without approval of Kim Manning-Lewis’ office of University Communications [in New Brunswick]. [Provost] Diner noted that the Newark Campus will have more freedom henceforth to promote and market the campus separately.17

Privatization of PLGUs: threat or promise?

Perhaps as a consequence of enduring perceptions that higher education has become increasingly inaccessible, as well as intensified state budget crises throughout the

Table 3. U.S.-located member institutions of the Association of American Universities (AAU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public land-grant universities</th>
<th>Private universities</th>
<th>Public non-land-grant universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of Arizona ♣</td>
<td>1. Brandeis University</td>
<td>1. Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University of California-Berkeley ♣</td>
<td>2. Brown University ♣♣</td>
<td>2. Indiana University ♣ (Bloomington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of California, Los Angeles ♣</td>
<td>5. Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>5. University of Colorado at Boulder ♣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of California, Santa Barbara ♣</td>
<td>7. Cornell University ♣♣ ‡</td>
<td>7. The University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Iowa State University</td>
<td>11. The Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>11. The University of Texas at Austin ♣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>15. Princeton University ♣♣</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey ♣ (New Brunswick)</td>
<td>16. Rice University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ohio State University ♣ (Columbus)</td>
<td>17. Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Penn State University ♣ (University Park)</td>
<td>18. Tulane University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>19. The University of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The University of Wisconsin-Madison ♣</td>
<td>20. University of Pennsylvania ♣♣</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While six of the ten University of California system campuses are members of the AAU, to maintain a conservative approach to the inventory analysis process, the University of California system is counted only once when reporting AAU data. Thus, for the purposes of this study, N for AAU-member PLGUs throughout the study is 16 (includes Cornell University, see ‡) instead of 20.

b The University of Nebraska-Lincoln was voted out of the AAU in April 2011.

c Syracuse University left the AAU voluntarily in May 2011.

Note: Campus locations in parentheses indicate distinctions made by Greene, not the AAU

‡ MIT and Cornell were designated land-grant institutions in 1863 and 1865, respectively. Due to its “independent” and “privately endowed” status, MIT is not considered a PLGU. Cornell continues its land-grant tradition through four state-supported colleges, as well as through cooperative extension; therefore, for the purposes of this study, Cornell is considered a PLGU.

2000s (or both), public support for public universities has declined steadily in recent decades. According to a discussion paper published by the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU, formerly the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges), the proportion of public university revenue arising from state appropriation is said to have declined continuously over the past few decades, from 77 percent in 1986 to 63 percent in 2007 (APLU, 2008). Rising tuition costs, tightening enrollments, increased student attrition, and decline in faculty salary increases are attributed to this slow but steady decline in public support, a trend that is likely to continue (Ehrenberg, 2006). Predictions from half a decade ago that public universities were on a “slow slide toward privatization” due to continuous budget cuts appear to be coming to fruition (Dillon, 2005), as discussions and accusations of privatizing public land-grant research institutions proliferate.

A few PLGUs stand out in particular as having been embroiled in the privatization debate in recent years due to cuts in state budget appropriations. In March 2011, Republican governor of Pennsylvania, Tom Corbett, proposed an unprecedented 52.4% ($182 million) reduction in state appropriation to Penn State University’s budget – including 50% cuts to Agricultural Research and Cooperative Extension (Powers 2011) – causing university officials to predict layoffs and tuition increases in the wake of an “apparent push toward privatization of public higher education” (The Ticker, 2011).

Talks of privatizing the University of California system have been ongoing for several years after a series of cuts in state appropriations, with a potential $500 million cut to the 2011-12 budget. The debate has become so well entrenched that, in 2009,
students created a satirical website called the UC Movement for Efficient Privatization “to ensure the swift and efficient privatization of the University of California.”18

As mentioned above, due to a proposed 13% ($125 million) reduction in state appropriation for the 2011-13 budget (Giroux, 2011), the University of Wisconsin-Madison has proposed the New Badger Partnership (NBP). The NBP is said to allow the institution “more flexibility” under “public authority” status, helping the flagship campus “to become more self-reliant so [it] can pursue [its] public mission in a more efficient and equitable manner” (Martin, 2011). The chancellor of the Madison campus, Biddy Martin – who left UW-Madison to become president of Amherst College in fall 2011 – stated staunchly that the NBP “is not a path toward privatization but preserving a great public research university” (UW-Madison and the State Budget, 2011). Nevertheless, it is anticipated that the plan will result in the Madison campus severing ties from the entire state university system. Such a measure could “increase competition between UW schools, duplicate administrative functions and weaken collaboration between the colleges,” thus exacerbating the perceived in-state pecking order within the University of Wisconsin system (Bauer, 2011).

Perhaps ironically, UW-Madison is considered the intellectual sire of the “Wisconsin Idea,” the Progressive Era philosophy of statewide university public service upon which most PLGUs’ public service missions are based. It is argued that privatization – or conversion to a “public authority” model as is the case with UW-Madison – will allow public universities to exercise more control over tuition costs and

to free themselves from the fiscal whims of state politicians; however, the potential loss of a mandated focus on university public service arises as a primary concern.

**Coming full circle?: renewed engagement with new accountability**

The early-21st century higher education accountability era appears to be undergirded by a vicious cycle. Loss of confidence in PLGUs’ societal contributions is used to substantiate decreased state support which leads to threats of higher tuition (and other private interest-oriented strategies) to fill budget gaps. Student attrition ensues along with decreased accessibility to higher education opportunity for low- and moderate-income citizens which, ultimately, reinforces the perception that PLGUs are increasingly disconnected from the needs of the communities that they were established to serve (Berdahl, 2011).

Despite (or, perhaps, because of) this, Benson and Harkavy maintain that the U.S. is experiencing a third revolution in the history of American research universities: the emergence of the “Cosmopolitan Civic University” which “function[s] simultaneously as universal and as local” and responds as an institution “not only *in* but *of* [its] local communit[y]” (2000, p. 48). Arguably, as it is defined, the Cosmopolitan Civic University represents a higher synthesis of previous models; an opportunity for the American research university to fulfill and balance effectively its research, teaching, and service functions. This idea is fundamental to the late-20th century university-community engagement movement that scholars credit to the work of Ernest Boyer (1990).

The public service legacy of 1890 universities is important to point out as this study wrestles with the idea that 21st century efforts to market PLGUs as engaged placemakers in their communities actually may be advancing a perception of community
capacity building disparities among PLGUs. Indeed, 1890 schools may be among those receiving the brunt of the effects. As previously indicated, some 1862 PLGUs are criticized for abandoning public service contracts with their states in pursuit of private research funding that gives higher education institutions an aura of national and global prestige. Conversely, the historically black 1890 universities appear to have managed not to lose sight of the land-grant public service mission. According to language used to describe the historic mission of 1890 PLGUs by the 1890 University Council of the APLU, these institutions have a strong commitment to being place-based public servants in and of their communities:

The 1890s have never forgotten the expectation that as historically Black land-grant institutions they must be relevant to the multitude of smaller, limited resource producers and entrepreneurs. When assisted, these individuals have great potential to (1) bring a wide range of skills and ideas for agriculture and natural resource practices; (2) to bring economic activity to rural communities; and (3) to supply a variety of specialized market niches. Therefore, the 1890 institutions have always sought innovative efforts to assist this clientele. (APLU, 2011)

Tourism is an industry that has the potential to accomplish these three overarching goals, particularly through the tourism planning and development mechanisms included in this study. Through cooperative extension tourism, universities are providing direct assistance to rural populations, helping its denizens to devise innovative ways to attract economic activity through farm tours and festivals that celebrate unique agricultural, culinary, and artistic products from the community. Academic programs in tourism and allied fields can help to prepare locals to develop the skills to participate in the industry. University-based conference and event services and facilities also can help to attract and accommodate visitors who are welcomed by campus-based visitor information centers that can promote local attractions, thus encouraging visitors to return to the area. I argue,
however, that without one or more of these mechanisms, 1890 schools and other PLGUs lack increasingly critical organizational capacity to fulfill their goals and, ultimately, to participate in helping their communities to increase their capacity for competitiveness in regional, national, and global place hierarchies.

Analyzing mechanisms of university-community tourism planning and development: Developing a national picture of PLGU capacity

As noted previously, tourism planning scholars acknowledge the importance of events and visitor information in tourism planning and development, as well as roles of university faculty in advising and consulting communities on how to plan for tourism development. Herein, the capacity inventory examines three primary mechanisms by which PLGUs contribute to tourism planning and development: (1) cooperative extension tourism, along with academic programs in tourism and allied fields; (2) campus-based conference and event management services and (3) campus-based visitor information centers. Depending on the extent these tourism planning and development mechanisms are conceptualized, managed, and utilized as forms of community engagement, I propose that PLGUs and comparable private universities can figure prominently in placemaking.

The chapter proceeds with constructing a national picture of university-community tourism planning and development capacity through the following analyses:

- Phase I analysis: PLGU tourism planning and development mechanisms as indicators of capacity
- Phase II analysis: Identifying levels of tourism planning and development capacity
- Phase III analysis: Who says it is tourism? Who says it is engagement? The marketing of PLGU tourism planning and development as placemaking
Tourism planning and development at private research universities and public non-land-grant research universities

**Phase I analysis: PLGU tourism planning and development mechanisms as indicators of capacity.**

This section discusses the first phase of analysis conducted in order to assess PLGU capacity levels across the U.S., which begins to address the study’s first research question and hypothesis. To gather this data, I relied primarily on information provided on PLGU websites. In some cases, I confirmed or corrected web-based information through survey phone interviews and/or site visits.

For this phase of the analysis, lists were developed indicating which PLGUs feature a specific tourism planning and development mechanism and which ones do not. Each list includes campus locations (where applicable) and distinguishes 1890 or historically black PLGUs from 1862 PLGUs. As indicators of perceived prestige, AAU-member institutions also are indicated, as well as PLGUs that are considered “Public Ivies” according to Greene (2001). Finally, relationships with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entities – the first capacity enhancement documented in this study – are reported for the three mechanisms that generally are charged with public interaction: cooperative extension tourism, conference and event services, and campus visitor information centers.

*Cooperative extension tourism and academic tourism programs.*

In the 21st century, cooperative extension encompasses an array of specializations reflective of the diverse needs and interests of an ever-expanding, high tech- and service-based economy. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s National Institute for
Food and Agriculture – or NIFA\(^{19}\), which is charged with funding and providing program leadership to land-grant cooperative extension nationally – some of these specializations include biotechnology, international agricultural systems (i.e., global engagement), and the Economics and Community Development (ECD) National Emphasis Area which works to “discover new economic opportunities, develop successful agricultural and nonagricultural enterprises, [and] take advantage of new and consumer-driven markets at both the local and international levels.”\(^{20}\)

Tourism development is a subset of the ECD, with particular emphasis on planning for tourism in rural areas. In response to changing economic structures in rural communities, in the mid-1990s, the Communities in Economic Transition Initiative identified four new extension service tracks: value-added manufacturing, home-based business, retail development, and recreation/tourism (McAlister, Teater, and Pope, 1993). With the subsequent creation of the National Extension Tourism (NET) Design Team, tourism appears to have emerged as a service track of its own.\(^{21}\) NIFA continues to support tourism planning and development efforts through land-grant cooperative extension, particularly forms of tourism that may be more likely to develop in rural areas such as agritourism, cultural heritage tourism, and nature-based or ecotourism.

Through land-grant universities and other partners, NIFA promotes research, education, and outreach activities that expand opportunities for rural tourism. Since 1998, NIFA competitive and formula grants have supported 65 research projects, including studies on the importance of local infrastructure in developing

---

\(^{19}\) NIFA was created by U.S. Congress in 2008 and replaces the former Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) which was established in 1994. See NIFA “About Us” at http://www.nifa.usda.gov/about/about.html, accessed March 11, 2011.


a tourist industry, attitudes towards tourism among local populations, and how best to promote local amenities without over-exploitation.\textsuperscript{22}

The NET design team hosts bi-annual conferences on university extension tourism activities throughout the U.S. (NET Information Clearinghouse, n.d.) Presentations and poster sessions offered at the 2011 NET conference represented topics that address one of nine broad tourism themes including community and regional planning and development; economic, environmental, and social impacts of tourism; and tourism education/training and research/evaluation. The diversity of NET topics suggests that PLGUs are playing a wide variety of roles in extension tourism scenarios, from researcher to consultant to collaborative partner/stakeholder. The NET conference is discussed in more detail as one of four PLGU tourism planning and development capacity enhancements documented for this study.

Table 4 lists PLGUs that offer cooperative extension tourism resources and those that do not. For this study, such resources are defined rather broadly and include faculty or extension agents specializing in tourism; evidence of sponsorship and/or participation in cooperative extension tourism projects, conferences, community workshops, and/or webinars; and availability of educational and/or informational resources on cooperative extension websites, including academic publications, technical reports, and online instructional guides or toolkits.

The list indicates that the majority of PLGUs (45 or 65%) participate in some form of cooperative extension tourism; nearly half of those (22 or 48%) were found to have a relationship with a community-based tourism marketing and/or policy entity. All 16 AAU-member PLGUs and 12 of the 14 “Public Ivy” PLGUs are represented in the “with” category. Of the 18 historically black 1890 PLGUs, five are represented in the “with” category; thus, these institutions comprise half of the 26 total PLGUs that do not offer cooperative extension tourism resources to their communities.

While assessing the quality of academic tourism programs and allied fields at PLGUs is not within the scope of this study, it is duly noted that the educational reform debate is ongoing. Herein, the inventory for this study does not claim to take into account the kind of training that is taking place at these institutions. Indeed, program leadership, faculty specializations, shifts in institutional priorities and economies, as well as overall human agency are among the various factors that can determine the emphasis and cultures of academic programs. This study seeks simply to acknowledge that the very presence of an academic tourism program or allied field indicates that tourism planning and development capacity likely exists within a PLGU.
Table 4. Cooperative extension tourism at PLGUs in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLGUs with cooperative extension tourism</th>
<th>PLGUs without cooperative extension tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of Arizona *</td>
<td>1. Tuskegee University (AL) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Auburn University (AL)</td>
<td>2. University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alabama A&amp;M University †</td>
<td>3. University of Connecticut-Storrs ♣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Arkansas ⊙</td>
<td>5. Delaware State University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Colorado State University ⊙</td>
<td>7. Florida A&amp;M University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. University of Florida-Gainesville * ◆</td>
<td>8. Fort Valley State University (GA) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. University of Hawaii-Manoa</td>
<td>10. Kentucky State University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Illinois-Urbana * ◆ ⊙</td>
<td>11. Southern University (LA) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Purdue University (IN) *</td>
<td>12. University of Massachusetts-Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Iowa State University *</td>
<td>13. Lincoln University (MO) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. University of Kentucky</td>
<td>15. Langston University (OK) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Louisiana State University ⊙</td>
<td>16. Oklahoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. University of Maine</td>
<td>17. Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. University of Maryland-College Park *◆</td>
<td>18. University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. University of Maryland-Eastern Shore † ⊙</td>
<td>19. South Carolina State University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Michigan State University * ◆</td>
<td>20. South Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mississippi State University ⊙</td>
<td>22. Prairie View A&amp;M University (TX) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Alcorn State University (MS) †</td>
<td>23. Washington State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Montana State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. University of Nebraska-Lincoln ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. University of Nevada-Reno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. University of New Hampshire ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Cornell University (NY) * ♣♣</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey * ◆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. New Mexico State University ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. North Carolina State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. North Dakota State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Ohio State University * ◆ ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Penn State University * ◆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Clemson University (SC) ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. University of Tennessee-Knoxville ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Texas A&amp;M University * ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Utah State University ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. University of Vermont ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University ⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Virginia State University †</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. West Virginia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. West Virginia State University †</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. University of Wisconsin-Madison * ◆⊙</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - AAU-member institution
† - historically black land-grant university (1890 school)
♣ - “Public Ivy” institution
⊙ - Relationship with tourism policy/marketing entity
♣♣ - Ivy League institution
Most of the PLGUs listed in the “with” category in Table 5 have academic programs in tourism or allied fields that are accredited by the Council on Accreditation of Parks, Recreation, Tourism, and Related Professions and/or the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration. Some of these programs – such as the Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management Program at North Carolina State University and the Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Sciences at Texas A&M University – lend expert capacity to cooperative extension tourism departments within the institution through their faculty.

Perhaps due to the enduring perception of tourism as a purely vocational field, this is the least common indicator of tourism planning and development capacity among PLGUs. Still, slightly more AAU-member institutions have academic programs in tourism and/or allied fields than not (9 “with” vs. 7 “without”). As with cooperative extension tourism, historically black 1890 PLGUs are underrepresented in this category as well, as only two out of 18 have academic programs in tourism and allied fields.
Table 5. Academic tourism programs at PLGUs in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLGUs with academic tourism programs</th>
<th>PLGUs without academic tourism programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Auburn University (AL)</td>
<td>1. Alabama A&amp;M University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University of Arkansas</td>
<td>2. Tuskegee University (AL) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Delaware State University †</td>
<td>4. University of Arizona * ♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of District of Columbia</td>
<td>5. University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of Georgia ♠</td>
<td>7. Colorado State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. University of Illinois-Urbana * ♠</td>
<td>10. Fort Valley State University (GA) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Purdue University (IN) *</td>
<td>11. University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Iowa State University *</td>
<td>12. Kentucky State University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kansas State University</td>
<td>13. Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. University of Maryland-Eastern Shore †</td>
<td>14. Southern University (LA) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. University of Massachusetts-Amherst</td>
<td>15. University of Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Michigan State University * ♠</td>
<td>16. University of Maryland-College Park * ♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. University of Missouri-Columbia *</td>
<td>17. University of Minnesota-Twin Cities * ♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. University of New Hampshire</td>
<td>18. Mississippi State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Cornell University (NY) * ♠</td>
<td>19. Alcorn State University (MS) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. North Carolina State University</td>
<td>20. Lincoln University, Missouri †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>22. University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Penn State University * ♠</td>
<td>23. University of Nevada-Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Clemson University (SC)</td>
<td>24. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey* ♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. University of Tennessean-Knoxville</td>
<td>25. New Mexico State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Utah State University</td>
<td>27. Ohio State University * ♠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>28. Langston University, Oklahoma †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Virginia State University †</td>
<td>29. Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Washington State University</td>
<td>30. University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* - AAU-member institution</td>
<td>31. South Carolina State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† - historically black land-grant university (1890 school)</td>
<td>32. South Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♠ - “Public Ivy” institution</td>
<td>33. Tennessee State University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ - Ivy League institution</td>
<td>34. Prairie View A&amp;M University (TX) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣♣ - Ivy League institution</td>
<td>35. University of Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. West Virginia University</td>
<td>37. West Virginia State University †</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - AAU-member institution
† - historically black land-grant university (1890 school)
♠ - “Public Ivy” institution
♣♣ - Ivy League institution
**PLGU conference and event services**

There is evidence to suggest that conference and event services have become prominent hubs of visitor activity within PLGU campus settings. Connell’s UK-based work (1996, 2000) provides conceptual groundwork for framing university conference and event management services as an entrepreneurial, revenue-generating activity with tourism planning and development implications.

Some land-grant university conference services departments and centers are integrated structurally with hotels, as is the case with the University of Georgia Inn and Conference Center, the Lowell Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the Kellogg Hotel and Conference Center at Michigan State University (see Figure 10).

![Kellogg Hotel & Conference Center](http://www.kelloggcenter.com/about/history.html)

Figure 10. As a “laboratory for hotel management” and “a venue for adult education,” the Kellogg Hotel and Conference Center at Michigan State University is billed as “more than as a campus hotel,” as the facility “fit[s] with the land grant mission of the University” of “service beyond the campus boundaries.” Retrieved from http://www.kelloggcenter.com/about/history.html, accessed July 1, 2011.
Other PLGU conference centers are clustered spatially with corporate-branded lodging facilities and even campus-based recreation areas, such as the University of Delaware Clayton Hall Conference Center and Courtyard Marriott (see Figure 11); the University of Wyoming Conference Center and Laramie Hilton Garden Inn; and the Conference Center and Inn at Clemson University in South Carolina which abuts the institution’s Walker Golf Course.

Figure 11. Spatial clustering of a conference center and hotel at the University of Delaware. Marketed as the "Official Hotel of the University of Delaware," the Courtyard Marriott is situated “just yards” from the university’s Clayton Hall Conference Center, one of several campus-based venues advertised by the institution’s Conference Services department. Retrieved from http://www.udel.edu/conferences/ and http://www.udel.edu/hotel/, accessed July 1, 2011.
With lodging, hospitality, and recreation facilities literally under one roof in some cases, all of the campus-based conference centers listed above maintain relationships with respective municipal or regional CVBs. Moreover, whereas conference facilities at some institutions fall within the purview of so-called auxiliary services – generally a quality of life enhancement unit of universities which, depending on the institutional structure, includes dining/food services, parking, transportation, vending, banking, and university bookstores – some of the aforementioned conference centers are housed under public service or community outreach and/or engagement units within their respective institutions. Thus, some institutions monitor and report regional economic impacts of their conference centers. For example, according to a recent study conducted by the Regional Dynamics and Economic Modeling Laboratory at the Strom Thurmond Institute of Government and Public Affairs, the Clemson University complex had a $14 million average annual direct, indirect, and induced impact on the institution’s four-county regional area during the “Great Recession” years (2006-2010) and supported nearly 350 jobs (Martin, et al, 2011).

The revenue-generating and economic impact potential of conference and event services and facilities perhaps explains, at least in part, why it is the most dominant mechanism of tourism planning and development, as nearly 74% of PLGUs included in this study feature it. Less than half (23 or 45%) of those were found to have relationships with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entities. Based on this analysis, there may be an association between conference and event services and perceived institutional prestige: all 16 AAU-member PLGUs, as well as all 14 “Public Ivy” PLGUs qualify. In fact, AAU-member institutions and “Public Ivies” represent nearly 40% of all PLGUs that feature conference and event services (see Table 6).
Table 6. Conference and event services at PLGUs in the U.S.

### PLGUs with conference and event services

| 1. | Auburn University (AL) |
| 2. | Tuskegee University (AL) ♠ |
| 3. | University of Alaska-Fairbanks |
| 4. | University of Arizona * ♣ |
| 5. | University of Arkansas |
| 6. | University of California (system) * ♣ ☼ |
| 7. | Colorado State University ☼ |
| 8. | University of Connecticut-Storrs ♣ |
| 9. | University of Delaware ♣ ☼ |
| 10. | University of Florida-Gainesville * ♣ ☼ |
| 11. | Florida A&M University ♠ |
| 12. | University of Georgia ♣ ☼ |
| 13. | Fort Valley State University (GA) ♠ |
| 14. | University of Hawaii-Manoa |
| 15. | University of Idaho |
| 16. | University of Illinois-Urbana * ♣ |
| 17. | Purdue University (IN) * ☼ |
| 18. | Iowa State University * ☼ |
| 19. | University of Kentucky |
| 20. | Louisiana State University |
| 21. | University of Maine ☼ |
| 22. | University of Maryland-College Park * ♣ ☼ |
| 23. | University of Massachusetts-Amherst |
| 24. | University of Maryland-Eastern Shore ♠ |
| 25. | Michigan State University * ♣ ☼ |
| 26. | University of Minnesota-Twin Cities * ♣ |
| 27. | Mississippi State University |
| 28. | University of Missouri-Columbia * |
| 29. | Montana State University |
| 30. | University of Nebraska-Lincoln ☼ |
| 31. | University of New Hampshire |
| 32. | Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey * ♣ |
| 33. | New Mexico State University ☼ |
| 34. | Cornell University (NY) * ♣ ♣ ☼ |
| 35. | North Carolina State University |
| 36. | North Dakota State University |
| 37. | Ohio State University * ♣ |
| 38. | Oklahoma State University |
| 39. | Oregon State University ☼ |
| 40. | Penn State University * ♣ |

| 41. | University of Rhode Island ☼ |
| 42. | Clemson University (SC) ☼ |
| 43. | University of Tennessee-Knoxville ☼ |
| 44. | Texas A&M University * |
| 45. | Utah State University ☼ |
| 46. | University of Vermont ☼ |
| 47. | Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University ☼ |
| 48. | Washington State University ☼ |
| 49. | West Virginia University ☼ |
| 50. | University of Wisconsin-Madison * ♣ ☼ |
| 51. | University of Wyoming |

### PLGUs without conference and event services

| 1. | Alabama A&M University ♠ |
| 2. | University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff ♠ |
| 3. | Delaware State University ♠ |
| 4. | University of District of Columbia |
| 5. | Kansas State University |
| 6. | Kentucky State University ♠ |
| 7. | Southern University, Louisiana ♠ |
| 8. | Alcorn State University (MS) ♠ |
| 9. | Lincoln University (MO) ♠ |
| 10. | University of Nevada-Reno |
| 11. | North Carolina A&T University ♠ |
| 12. | Langston University (OK) ♠ |
| 13. | South Carolina State University ♠ |
| 14. | South Dakota State University |
| 15. | Tennessee State University ♠ |
| 16. | Prairie View A&M University (TX) ♠ |
| 17. | Virginia State University ♠ |
| 18. | West Virginia State University ♠ |

- AAU-member institution
- “Public Ivy” institution
- Relationship with tourism policy/marketing entity
- Historically black land-grant university (1890 school)
- Ivy League institution
Conversely, of the 18 historically black 1890 PLGUs, only four (22%) were found to have conference and event services departments and/or facilities. These institutions comprise a sizeable majority (77%) of PLGUs in the “without” category.

**Campus-based visitor information and visitor centers.**

Buhalis (2000) and Inskeep (1991) both acknowledge that access to and quality of visitor information are critical factors in sustainable destination development. CIVSA provides a comprehensive web-based bibliography of published literature and student theses on various research topics related to campus-based information services (http://civsa.org/research/reference_list.shtml). Of the works listed, a few appear to explore the impact that campus-based welcome and visitor information centers have on a prospective student’s perception of the institution. However, none appear to explore connections between these visitor centers and local tourism activity.

Yet, there is evidence that a number of PLGU welcome and visitor information centers have relationships with local and state tourism entities. Some PLGUs like Rutgers and Purdue market themselves as destinations through visitor information websites and online visitor guides (see Figure 12a and 12b). Other PLGUs couple university student recruitment and admissions functions with local and regional place promotion. For example:

- The $7.5 million, 12,000 square foot Visitor Center at Rutgers University was opened in October 2009 on its flagship campus in New Brunswick/Piscataway. Less than two years later, the Rutgers Visitor Center was designated as one of 20

Rutgers University's Attractions and Destinations webpage promotes “a wealth of enlightening and engaging attractions and destinations” among its New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden campuses “for visitors of all ages.” Retrieved from http://www.rutgers.edu/visit-us/attractions-destinations, accessed June 1, 2011.
official New Jersey visitor information centers through an agreement between the university and the state’s Office of Travel and Tourism. The Visitor Center at the University of Georgia in Athens was opened in 1996 to coincide with the Olympic Games in Atlanta. In previous years, there was resistance among university administrators to establish a visitor welcome center; however, when they learned that the Games could attract as many as 100,000 per day to the campus, the university president quickly put things into motion to open the Visitor Center. Since 1996, it is estimated that the Visitor Center “provides student-led tours to over 25,000 visitors each year.” It is an Athens CVB partner.

- The University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW) has two campus-based information entities. The UW Campus Information Center serves as a hub for prospective students and their families for admissions purposes. The newer UW Welcome Center is part of the university’s $83 million Park Street Development, a mixed-use, public-private partnership facility completed in 2006 that features office space, housing, and parking facilities. Located on “one of the city’s main corridors to campus” with “both walk-in and drive-through service for visitors and tourists,” the UW Welcome Center is cited as a “collaborative effort.”

---


24 For more information about the Centre County/Penn State Visitor Center, see http://www.psu.edu/ur/archives/intercom_2000/Nov2/visitorcenter.html and http://www.visitpennstate.org/about/, accessed March 11, 2011.
between UW’s Visitor & Information Programs and the Greater Madison CVB. The UW Welcome Center also is listed as a Greater Madison CVB partner.  

Table 7 indicates that 62% of PLGUs included in this study have campus visitor information centers, making it a slightly less salient tourism planning and development mechanism than cooperative extension tourism programs. Of the 43 PLGUs that feature campus visitor information centers, 15 or about 35% were found to have relationships with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entities. AAU-member institutions and “Public Ivies” are slightly less represented in the “with” category, however, as 17 AAUs have campus visitor information centers compared to 19 AAUs with cooperative extension tourism mechanisms. Interestingly, the three PLGUs that are both AAU members and “Public Ivies” in the “without” category also are Big 10 universities. Penn State University is served by a visitor center that is operated by a local CVB, and though the visitor center carries the university’s name, it is not administratively affiliated with the institution (University employee, personal communication, 2011).

As with the conference and event services and cooperative extension tourism mechanisms, the historically black 1890 universities comprise a majority (54%) of the “without” category. Four of the institutions have visitor information centers while 14 do not.

For further information and quoted descriptions of the UW Welcome Center and its relationship with the Greater Madison CVB, see http://www.vip.wisc.edu/visitor-centers.html as well as UW’s Visitor & Information Programs 2008-09 annual report (p. 3) at http://www.vip.wisc.edu/images/Annual_Report_0809.pdf. For a list of Greater Madison CVB education partners that includes the UW Welcome Center, see http://www.visitmadison.com/partners/our-partners/index.cfm?listsearch_submit=1&catID=159&subcatID=0&regionID=0&listing_keyword=&x=5&y=7. Websites accessed March 11, 2011.
Table 7. Campus visitor information centers at PLGUs in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLGUs with campus visitor information centers</th>
<th>PLGUs without campus visitor information centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of Arizona * ♣</td>
<td>1. Auburn University (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff †</td>
<td>2. Alabama A&amp;M University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University of California (system) * ♣ ☼</td>
<td>3. Tuskegee University (AL) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Connecticut-Storrs ♣</td>
<td>5. University of Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. University of Delaware ♣</td>
<td>6. Florida A&amp;M University †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Delaware State University †</td>
<td>7. University of District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fort Valley State University (GA) †</td>
<td>10. Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Idaho</td>
<td>11. Southern University (LA) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Purdue University (IN) * ☼</td>
<td>12. University of Maryland-Eastern Shore †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Iowa State University * ☼</td>
<td>13. Michigan State University * ♣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kentucky State University †</td>
<td>15. Lincoln University (MO) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>16. Montana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. University of Maryland-College Park * ♣ ☼</td>
<td>18. North Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. University of Massachusetts-Amherst ☼</td>
<td>19. Langston University (OK) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mississippi State University</td>
<td>21. Tennessee State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. University of Missouri-Columbia *</td>
<td>22. Penn State University * ♣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>23. Prairie View A&amp;M University (TX) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. New Mexico State University ☼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Cornell University (NY) * ♣ ♣</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. North Carolina State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ohio State University * ♣</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Oklahoma State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. University of Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Clemson University (SC) ☼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. South Dakota State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. University of Tennessee-Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Texas A&amp;M University * ☼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Utah State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. University of Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Washington State University ☼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. West Virginia University ☼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. University of Wisconsin-Madison * ♣ ☼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - AAU-member institution
† - historically black land-grant university (1890 school)
♦ - “Public Ivy” institution
☼ - Relationship with tourism policy/marketing entity
♣♣ - Ivy League institution
Summary of phase I analysis.

The first phase analysis yields the following noteworthy patterns and comparisons, as illustrated in Table 8.

| Table 8. PLGU tourism planning and development mechanisms, by group and by subgroup |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|  | Cooperative extension tourism | Academic tourism programs | Conference and event services | Campus visitor information centers |
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| PLGUs (N=69) | 45 (63%) | 24 (37%) | 30 (43%) | 39 (57%) | 51 (73%) | 18 (27%) | 43 (63%) | 26 (37%) |
| AAU institutions | | | | | | | | |
| % of yes/no | 16 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 14 | 3 |
| % of public AAUs | 36% | 0% | 53% | 44% | 100% | 0% | 30% | 12% |
| HBCUs | | | | | | | | |
| [% of yes/no] | 5 | 13 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 14 |
| % of HBCUs | 11% | 50% | 13% | 35% | 6% | 79% | 9% | 54% |
| Public Ivies | | | | | | | | |
| [% of yes/no] | 12 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 27 | 14 | 11 | 3 |
| % of Public Ivies | 27% | 8% | 20% | 57% | 27% | 0% | 25% | 12% |

- Overall, 73% of PLGUs feature conference and event services, making it the most common tourism planning and development mechanism of the four included in this study. Cooperative extension tourism and campus visitor information centers have equal levels of representation among PLGUs at 63%. At 43%, academic tourism programs is the least featured mechanism among PLGUs.
- Of the three subgroups documented in the phase I analysis, PLGUs that are members of the AAU have the highest representation in each of the tourism planning and development mechanism areas (see “% of yes/no”).
• One hundred percent of AAU institutions and “Public Ivies” feature conference and event services, making it the most common mechanism among PLGUs that are perceived as leading, elite public research universities in the U.S. One hundred percent of AAU-member institutions also are involved with cooperative extension tourism.

• In contrast to AAU-member and “Public Ivy” PLGUs, historically black 1890 universities have the lowest representation in each of the tourism planning and development mechanism areas. This is particularly so for the conference and event services and campus visitor information mechanisms, where 1890 universities represent 79% and 54%, respectively, of PLGUs that do not feature these mechanisms. The 1890 institutions also represent half of the institutions that do not feature cooperative extension tourism programs or resources.

Finally, as an initial assessment of capacity, three mechanisms that generally interact with the public were documented for relationships with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entities (e.g., municipal/county CVB, chamber of commerce, state tourism office). Such relationships were found to be most common among PLGUs with cooperative extension tourism programs (48%), less common among PLGUs with conference and event services (45%), and least common among PLGUs with campus visitor information centers (35%). These findings alone provide minimal insight regarding tourism programming and networking capacity among these PLGUs, which substantiates an assessment of other capacity enhancements. Phase II reports this analysis. The local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing relationship findings cited here at least confirm, however, that the PLGU organizational units under investigation are, indeed, tourism planning and development mechanisms as suggested by Gunn (2002).
Phase II analysis: identifying levels of tourism planning and development capacity.

While the phase I analysis reveals patterns and comparisons that indicate differences among types of PLGU, a more detailed and perhaps more revealing analysis is possible. By integrating the lists created for the phase one analysis, a hierarchy of tourism planning and development capacity among the PLGUs emerges. The following phase II analysis classifies PLGUs according to the following criteria:

- Level IV capacity – PLGUs that feature all four mechanisms
- Level III capacity – PLGUs that feature three of the four mechanisms
- Level II capacity – PLGUs that feature two of the four mechanisms
- Level I capacity – PLGUs that feature one of the four mechanisms
- Tourism planning and development capacity N/A – PLGUs that feature none of the four mechanisms

The phase II analysis continues to address the study’s first research question and hypothesis regarding different tourism planning and development capacity levels among PLGUs. Phase II also begins to address the broader question of PLGU tourism planning and development as a form of community engagement. Indicators of community engagement – including successful designation to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification as well as voluntary membership in Campus Compact – are noted. It must be reiterated that as an elective classification, the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification does not represent a comprehensive national assessment; therefore, non-designated institutions should not be viewed as lacking commitment to their communities. Institutions that are designated, however, may be viewed as having demonstrated significant commitment to community
engagement. Institutions that elect to join Campus Compact are viewed similarly, as membership and annual dues generally are endorsed by an institution’s president (Campus Compact, 2011).

As mentioned in the methodology section of chapter 1, indicators of affiliation with local and national entities related to the tourism planning and development mechanisms are documented as well. These tourism planning and development programming and networking capacity enhancements suggest cooperation and/or collaboration with local and national entities. Such collaboration may indicate an institution’s ability to provide tourism planning and development services that fulfill its education, research, and public service mission, as well as its ability to build and manage relationships with external entities that help it to fulfill its mission more effectively (Glickman and Servon, 1998). The documented programming and networking capacity enhancements include institutional affiliation with CVBs and chambers of commerce; involvement with the National Extension Tourism Design Team, a national cooperative extension tourism research coalition; membership with CIVSA and/or the ACCED-I, two associations that represent campus visitor information and campus-based conference and event services professionals, respectively; and membership with Unique Venues, an online conference and event venue marketing organization.

**Level IV PLGU analysis.**

Table 9 lists the 13 PLGUs that feature all four tourism planning and development mechanisms. These Level IV capacity institutions represent 19% of the 69 PLGUs included in this study.

**Institutional types.** As was suggested in the phase one analysis, perceived institutional prestige and tourism planning and development capacity levels may be associated. Nearly half
(6 or 46%) of Level IV capacity institutions are AAU members. Of all of the capacity levels, Level IV is comprised of the highest percentage of AAU members. None of the historically black 1890 PLGUs rank as Level IV capacity institutions.

**Community engagement.** Commitment to community engagement appears to be a commonly held value among the 13 Level IV capacity institutions, as 11 of them (85%) are dues paying members of Campus Compact. Two of the Level IV PLGUs (15%) also are designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. These two institutions – the University of Georgia and Cornell University – also are Campus Compact members.

**Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements.** As illustrated in Table 10, of the four documented tourism planning and development capacity enhancements, two are most prevalent among the Level IV capacity institutions. Nine of the 13 institutions (69%) currently maintain memberships with CIVSA. Nine of the institutions (69%) also were represented by faculty and/or cooperative extension agents at the 2011 National Extension Tourism Conference in Charleston, SC. The two other capacity enhancements also were fairly well represented. Seven of the Level IV institutions (54%) are members of ACCED-I, and nearly half (46%) market campus-based conference and event spaces with Unique Venues. Collectively, these active memberships with professional organizations and participation in national convenings on tourism scholarship suggest strong programming and networking tourism planning and development capacity among Level IV PLGUs.
### Table 9. Level IV PLGU tourism planning and development capacity

PLGUs with all four of the tourism planning and development mechanisms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic tourism program</th>
<th>Conference and event services</th>
<th>Cooperative extension tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus visitor information center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida-Gainesville * ♣ CC</td>
<td>6. University of New Hampshire CC</td>
<td>11. Texas A&amp;M University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University of Georgia ♣ E, CC</td>
<td>7. Cornell University (NY) *♣♣ E. CC</td>
<td>12. Utah State University CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Purdue University (IN) * CC</td>
<td>8. North Carolina State University CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Iowa State University *</td>
<td>9. Clemson University (SC) CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Missouri-Columbia * CC</td>
<td>10. University of Tennessee-Knoxville CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - member of the Association of American Universities  
♣ - “Public Ivy” institution  
♣♣ - Ivy League institution  
E - named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification  
CC - member of Campus Compact

### Table 10. Level IV PLGU tourism planning and development capacity enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVSA</th>
<th>ACCED-I</th>
<th>Unique Venues</th>
<th>National Extension Tourism Conference 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. University of Georgia ♣ E, CC</td>
<td>2. University of Missouri-Columbia * CC</td>
<td>2. Purdue University (IN) * CC</td>
<td>2. University of Georgia ♣ E, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Purdue University (IN) * CC</td>
<td>3. University of New Hampshire CC</td>
<td>3. Iowa State University *</td>
<td>3. Purdue University (IN) * CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of Tennessee-Knoxville CC</td>
<td>7. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University CC</td>
<td>7. Clemson University (SC) CC</td>
<td>8. Texas A&amp;M University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Texas A&amp;M University *</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Utah State University CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Level III PLGU analysis.**

Table 11 lists the 29 PLGUs that feature three of the four tourism planning and development mechanisms. These Level III capacity institutions represent 42% of the 69 PLGUs included in this study. Of all of the capacity levels identified, Level III is the largest.

*Institutional types.* As with Level IV, Level III suggests possible association between perceived institutional prestige and tourism planning and development capacity levels, as 10 (35%) of these institutions are AAU members. Of all of the identified capacity levels, Level III has the highest number (11) and percentage (38%) of “Public Ivies”; levels IV and II have two (15%) and one (7%) “Public Ivy” institutions, respectively.

The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore is the only historically black 1890 PLGU that ranks among the 29 Level III capacity institutions (see Figure 13). The institution features the Richard A. Henson Center, a “mini-conference” and hotel facility that houses the university’s hotel and restaurant management program. The Henson Center also houses the university’s Rural Development Center which oversees the Skipjack.net project, a tourism and economic development initiative funded by USDA Rural Development designed and Maryland Cooperative Extension. Skipjack.net aims to provide Eastern Shore communities and cultural heritage businesses and organizations a web-based venue for place-product marketing. It also claims to serve the general public with informational and educational resources about the Delmarva Peninsula’s regional cultural heritage and nature-based attractions, with some emphasis on preserving Native and African American history. As the only 1890 PLGU with this combination of mechanisms, the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore may serve as a model for other 1890 PLGUs interested in increasing programming and networking capacity for tourism planning and development in their communities.
Within Level III, there are three subgroups based on tourism planning and development mechanism combinations. The largest of these subgroups is the campus visitor information center, conference and event services, and cooperative extension tourism combination with 16 PLGUs represented. Of the three subgroups, this one has the highest concentration of AAU members (7 or 44%) and “Public Ivy” institutions (7 or 44%); when combined, the other two subgroups still have fewer AAU members and “Public Ivy” institutions. This subgroup also features the only four PLGUs in this study that possess all identified capacity enhancements. This is discussed in further detail below.

**Community engagement.** Albeit to a lesser extent than Level IV capacity institutions, commitment to community engagement appears to be common among the 29 Level III capacity institutions, as 19 of them (65%) are dues paying members of Campus Compact. Six
of the Level III institutions (20%) are designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. This is a slightly higher percentage than Level IV, which has two (15%) Carnegie Community Engagement institutions in its ranks.

Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements. As illustrated in Table 12, of the four documented tourism planning and development capacity enhancements, representation at the 2011 National Extension Tourism Conference is the most prevalent among Level III capacity institutions. Eighteen of the 29 institutions (62%) were represented by faculty and/or cooperative extension agents at that conference. An equal number and proportion (16 or 55%) of Level III PLGUs currently maintain memberships with CIVSA and ACCED-I. As with Level IV, nearly half (45%) of the Level III PLGUs market campus-based conference and event spaces with Unique Venues. Collectively, this assessment suggests a level of programming and networking tourism planning and development capacity among Level III PLGUs that is similar to Level IV PLGUs.

As mentioned previously, the campus visitor information center, conference and event services, and cooperative extension tourism subgroup is the largest within Level III. This subgroup is distinguished further by having within its ranks the only four PLGUs in this study that feature all identified capacity enhancements. Table 11 and Table 12 both indicate these PLGUs in bold type: (1) Colorado State University, (2) University of Maine, (3) University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, and (4) Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, which is a case study institution for this research project. Interestingly, none of these PLGUs has academic programs in tourism or allied fields; yet, each has academic and/or cooperative extension faculty who are engaged with the National Extension Tourism’s network of scholars.
Table 11. Level III PLGU tourism planning and development capacity
PLGUs with three of the four tourism planning and development mechanisms

NOTE: There are no Level III PLGUs with a campus info, extension tourism, and academic tourism combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus visitor information center</th>
<th>Academic tourism program</th>
<th>Academic tourism program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference and event services</td>
<td>Conference and event services</td>
<td>Campus visitor information center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative extension tourism</td>
<td>Cooperative extension tourism</td>
<td>Conference and event services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. University of Arizona * ♣
2. University of California System * ♣
3. **Colorado State University** CC
4. University of Kentucky CC
5. Louisiana State University
6. **University of Maine** CC
7. University of Maryland-College Park * ♣
8. **University of Minnesota-Twin Cities** * ♣
9. Mississippi State University E
10. University of Nebraska-Lincoln
11. **Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey** * E, CC
12. New Mexico State University
13. Ohio State University * ♣
14. University of Vermont CC
15. West Virginia University E, CC
16. University of Wisconsin-Madison * ♣

1. Auburn University E, CC
2. University of Arkansas
3. University of Hawaii-Manoa CC
4. University of Illinois-Urbana *
5. University of Maryland-Eastern Shore †
6. Michigan State University *
7. North Dakota State University
8. Penn State University *

1. University of Delaware ♣
2. University of Idaho E, CC
3. **University of Massachusetts-Amherst** E, CC
4. Oklahoma State University CC
5. **Washington State University** CC

* - AAU-member institution
♣ - “Public Ivy” institution
E - institution named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification
CC - member of Campus Compact

Note: PLGUs listed in bold type feature all four tourism planning and development capacity enhancements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVSA</th>
<th>ACCED-I</th>
<th>Unique Venues</th>
<th>National Extension Tourism Conference 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. University of Vermont CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. University of Vermont CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - AAU-member institution  
♣ - “Public Ivy” institution  
E - institution named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification  
CC - member of Campus Compact  
Note: PLGUs listed in bold type feature all four tourism planning and development capacity enhancements.
Level II PLGU analysis.

Table 13 lists the 11 PLGUs that feature two of the four tourism planning and development mechanisms. These Level II capacity institutions represent 17% of the 69 PLGUs included in this study.

Institutional types. The mix of PLGUs represented in Level II further suggests possible association between perceived institutional prestige and tourism planning and development capacity. Whereas AAU-member PLGUs comprise 46% of Level IV and 35% of Level III, there are no AAU-member PLGUs among the Level II institutions. Moreover, of the 11 Level II PLGUs, only one (9%) – the University of Connecticut-Storrs – is considered a “Public Ivy.” The first group of historically black 1890 PLGUs appears at this point in the analysis. Four (36%) of the 11 Level II capacity PLGUs are historically black 1890 institutions.

Community engagement. Commitment to community engagement among the 11 Level II capacity institutions is similar to indicators for levels IV and III. Eight (72%) of the Level II PLGUs are dues paying members of Campus Compact. Four (36%) of the Level II PLGUs are designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification; these institutions also are members of Campus Compact.

Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements. While several of the Level II capacity PLGUs feature cooperative extension tourism programs and resources, as well as academic tourism programs, none of the Level II PLGUs were represented by academic and/or cooperative extension faculty at the 2011 National Extension Tourism Conference. Herein, this tourism planning and development capacity enhancement is not included in Table 14. Of the three documented capacity enhancements, membership with ACCED-I is slightly more prevalent than membership with CIVSA and Unique Venues campus-based event facility marketing service. Overall, less than half of Level II institutions are affiliated
with these capacity enhancements, a lower proportion than levels IV and III. It must be noted that the only Level II historically black 1890 PLGU affiliated with a capacity enhancement is Delaware State University; it is a member of CIVSA.

Table 13. Level II PLGU tourism planning and development capacity
PLGUs with two of the four tourism planning and development mechanisms

NOTE: There are no Level II PLGUs with a conference and event services and academic tourism combination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative extension tourism</th>
<th>Campus visitor information center</th>
<th>Cooperative extension tourism</th>
<th>Cooperative extension tourism</th>
<th>Campus visitor information center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware State University †</td>
<td>Delaware State University †</td>
<td>University of Alaska-Fairbanks</td>
<td>University of Nevada-Reno CC</td>
<td>University of Connecticut-Storrs ♣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University †</td>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University † CC</td>
<td>Montana State University E, CC</td>
<td>Campus visitor information center</td>
<td>Fort Valley State University (GA) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon State University E, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Montana State University E, CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Montana State University E, CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon State University E, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oregon State University E, CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Oregon State University E, CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Level II PLGU tourism planning and development capacity enhancements

Note: None of the Level II PLGUs participated in the 2010 NET Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVSA</th>
<th>Unique Venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Delaware State University †</td>
<td>1. Montana State University E, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Oregon State University E, CC</td>
<td>3. Oregon State University E, CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

♣ - “Public Ivy” institution
† - historically black land-grant university (1890 school)
E - named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification
CC - member of Campus Compact
**Level I PLGU analysis.**

Table 15 lists the 9 PLGUs that feature all four tourism planning and development mechanisms. These Level I capacity institutions represent about 13% of the 69 PLGUs included in this study.

*Institutional type.* As with Level II, there are no AAU-member PLGUs among the Level I institutions. Moreover, there are no “Public Ivy” PLGUs at this level. Seven of the nine Level I institutions (77%) are historically black 1890 PLGUs. The two non-historically black PLGUs – South Dakota State University and the University of Wyoming – both are located in states within the depopulating Great Plains region.

*Community engagement.* Institutional commitment to community engagement is less evident among Level I PLGUs when compared to Levels IV, III and II. Of the eight Level I institutions, three (37%) are dues paying members of Campus Compact. None of the Level I institutions are designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.

*Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements.* None of the Level I institutions were found to have any of the programming and networking capacity enhancements included in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15. Level I PLGU tourism planning and development capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLGUs with one of the four tourism planning and development mechanisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension tourism only</th>
<th>Campus info only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alabama A&amp;M University †</td>
<td>1. University of Arkansas – Pine Bluff †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alcorn State University †</td>
<td>2. Kentucky State University † CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. West Virginia State University † CC</td>
<td>3. South Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic tourism only – 1. University of District of Columbia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference and event services only – 1. University of Wyoming CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tuskegee University (AL) †</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† - historically black land-grant university (1890 school)
† E - institution named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification
CC - member of Campus Compact
The “N/A” category analysis.

Table 16 lists the 7 PLGUs that feature none of the tourism planning and development mechanisms. These are institutions where tourism planning and development capacity is not applicable. The “N/A” (Non Applicable) institutions represent roughly 10% of the 69 PLGUs included in this study.

Institutional type. Historically black 1890 PLGUs comprise 100% of the “N/A” level. No AAU-member PLGUs or “Public Ivy” PLGUs appear at the “N/A” level, which provides further evidence that perceived institutional prestige and tourism planning and development capacity may be associated.

Community engagement. Unlike institutions in the other levels, institutions in the “N/A” group appear to have the strongest commitment to community engagement. Six of the seven “N/A” PLGUs (86%) are dues paying members of Campus Compact. One of these institutions, Tennessee State University, is designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. As suggested in a recent Campus Compact study, historically black colleges and universities scored high for student time commitment to public service, use of service learning among faculty, and public service as a graduation requirement (Campus Compact, 2011). This analysis perhaps corroborates Campus Compact’s findings.

Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements. None of the “N/A” level institutions were found to have the programming and networking capacity enhancements included in this study.
More capacity through clustering?: campus-based hotel, museum, and golf course facilities.

As suggested previously, while in the process of conducting the capacity inventory, I encountered several PLGUs where tourism planning and development mechanisms are clustered spatially with campus-based visitor attraction facilities. At first, the clustering phenomenon appeared primarily to involve the coupling (or tripling, depending on one’s perspective) of conference and event services departments with hotels and/or conference centers. As my investigation continued, however, I began to observe occurrences of other types of clusters, particularly among Level IV and III capacity PLGUs. These include:

- North Carolina State University, where the E. Carroll Joyner Visitor Center – copiously branded by local corporations like Harris Teeter and Wachovia (now Wells Fargo) bank – is situated next to the McKimmon Conference Center. The McKimmon Conference Center is a self-supporting unit that is mandated to serve as an academic, government, nonprofit, and corporate training event facility, thus making it partially

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. PLGU tourism planning and development capacity N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLGUs with none of the four tourism planning and development mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Southern University (LA) †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lincoln University (MO) † CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. North Carolina A&amp;T University † CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Langston University † CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. South Carolina State University † CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tennessee State University † EE CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prairie View A&amp;M University (TX) † CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† - historically black land-grant university (1890 school)  
EE - institution named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification  
CC - member of Campus Compact

- Texas A&M University, where the J.Earl Rudder Conference and Events Center houses the university’s conference and events services department and the university’s Appelt Aggieland Visitor Center (http://visit.tamu.edu/).
- Mississippi State University, where the Cullis and Gladys Wade Clock Museum and the university’s Welcome Center share a facility (http://www.visit.msstate.edu/).

One particularly interesting example is the Conference Center and Inn at Clemson University. As illustrated in Figure 14, Clemson University’s conference and event services department is situated within the Conference Center and Inn, a destination cluster consisting of a conference facility, a hotel, and a golf course. As suggested previously, by documenting and reporting regional economic impacts of this clustered tourist and recreational facility, this Level IV capacity PLGU markets the Center not only as a commercial facility that hosts visitors but as a social venture as well. dt ogilvie, Professor for Business Strategy at Rutgers Business School and founding director for the Center for Urban Entrepreneurship and Economic Development, defines social ventures thusly:

We have for profit businesses and we have nonprofit businesses. A social venture is a hybrid. Simultaneously it is about making profit but it is also about creating social good, social benefit, or solving some social problem. An example might be a green business. So, there is IceStone Countertops. They take recycled glass and recycled materials and make these counters that are beautiful. There is a bakery that hires people who otherwise would not be hired. So, if you hire welfare mothers, for instance, and they work in your organization, you are trying to make a profit and you are hiring people who otherwise couldn’t get jobs. So, you are addressing a social
issue there. Or you are hiring ex-offenders; that is part of your business model, to hire these people and at the same time to have them produce some product that you sell. (Personal communication, Sept 1, 2010)

Based on this definition, the Conference Center and Inn is being promoted as a venture that creates social benefit, as it is said to stimulate job development (“For every 10 jobs created at the Conference Center and Inn, an additional seven jobs are created by spillover at other local businesses”) and to generate revenue for local and state government (Martin, et al, 2011). Moreover, the Center is portrayed as advancing the institution’s educational mission by providing students with research opportunities in “business planning, water runoff, customer
satisfaction, [and] marketing,” as well as providing training opportunities to an estimated 1,500 tourism majors since the Center opened in 1995 (Nixon, 2010):

> “Many Clemson students have benefited from internships, practicums and entry-level jobs in the hospitality field. Adding a skilled work force in an important industry in South Carolina,” [Jeff Martin, director of the Conference Center and Inn] said. “The Conference Center and Inn, from its inception, was designed to support the academic mission of the university and the economic value of South Carolina.” (Martin, et al, 2011; emphasis added)

By linking “designed” tourism planning and development capacity with educational and regional economic development goals, the Conference Center and Inn is advanced as a central player in communicating Clemson University’s value to broader society. Indeed, this strategic message could generate even more patronage from community organizations, area corporations, and government entities that subscribe to a philosophy of increasing local multiplier effects by supporting local businesses. Academicians at the university and externally may decide to host meetings and conferences there not only based on location and amenity factors but also because doing so supports undergraduate student education and degree attainment. In this scenario, the Conference Center and Inn destination cluster appears to be positioning itself and the institution to help improve quality of life in its region by engaging the surrounding community, which is a distinct placemaking activity.

**Hotel, museum, and golf facility analysis.**

The Clemson example and others prompted me to investigate the extent to which Level IV and Level III capacity PLGUs feature combinations of hotel, museum, and golf facilities. Also, while they may not have the same tourism planning and development mechanisms as higher capacity PLGUs, I wondered if some lower capacity PLGUs feature these facilities as indicators of potential tourism-related placemaking capacity. According to a PLGU historian interviewed for this study, 1890 institutions – which, as established
previously, comprise the bulk of the lower capacity level institutions – tend to invest in
developing museums more than any other type of visitor attraction included in this study:

The 1890 schools are more likely to have museums than they would visitor centers or
conference centers. Museums are a way to preserve history and to showcase heritage,
and that is what the 1890 schools and other historically black colleges and universities
have been viewed as being charged with. Any number of these schools have museums
that are used not only for prospective students and their families but also as meeting
and gathering places for the broader community. We are approached quite often by
community members who want to use our museum and other campus facilities for
their family reunions which can draw hundreds of people from all over the country.
That is decent money for the university and our dining services during the summer
months when most students are away. This also helps to keep us relevant in the minds
of the community. They continue to see us as a constant resource. (1890 PLGU faculty
member, personal communication, May 12, 2011)

Based on these observations, the capacity analysis was augmented with an inventory
of hotel, museum, and golf facilities at PLGUs. PLGUs with at least one hotel, museum, or
golf course were indicated. In many cases, PLGUs had more than one of these facilities.

While these numbers are not treated as significant for this particular inventory analysis, they
were reported parenthetically as a matter of record.

Table 17 summarizes the presence of these facilities at each capacity level. This
analysis further clarifies distinctions among the levels, albeit in somewhat unexpected ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17. PLGU hotels, museums, and golf courses by capacity level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV, n=13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III, n=29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II, n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I, n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A, n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most and least common facilities. Of the three facilities, museums are the most common, as 88% of the PLGUs included in this study were found to have at least one campus-based museum. Collegiate golf courses came in second at 52% while hotels ranked as the least common facility type at 32%.

Representation of total by level. Since it includes more institutions than any other level, as to be expected, Level III institutions across the board represent the largest percentage of PLGUs that feature each facility. Even though Level IV has less than half the number of PLGUs listed in Level III, it ranks second in this regard, perhaps as a testament to the high tourism capacity among its institutions. Level II institutions rank third across each category. While Level I ranks fourth in representation among PLGUs with hotels and golf courses, in a somewhat unexpected twist, this group is slightly less represented than the “N/A” category with regard to museums. This is explained further below.

Presence of facilities within the levels. An examination of the presence of hotel, museum, and golf course facilities within each level reveals highest concentrations among Level IV institutions. Indeed, 100% of Level IV PLGUs have at least one campus-based museum (interestingly, so do Level II PLGUs); 77% have golf courses; and 62% have hotels. While Level III is not far behind Level IV with regard to concentration of museums and golf courses (90% vs. 100% and 76% vs. 77%, respectively), the difference between them is greater with regard to the presence of hotels (45% for Level III vs. 69% for Level IV).

Levels II, I, and “N/A” show consistently for presence of hotels and golf courses. Perhaps as to be expected, none of the “N/A” institutions were found to have hotels or golf courses; yet, nearly all of them (86%) have museums. In fact, 12 of the 18 historically black 1890 institutions (66%) have museums, a clear majority. This finding supports the PLGU historian’s observation regarding historically black 1890 institutions’ tendency to feature
museums more than any other tourism-related facility. Yet, the overall presence of museums among 1890 institutions does not compare with the 51 non-historically black PLGUs, as 49 (96%) of these institutions feature at least one museum.

Institutional prestige. Perceived institutional prestige continues to be a theme of potential association in this analysis. As Table 18a and Table 18b illustrate, AAU-member PLGUs and “Public Ivy” PLGUs conform to the general finding that museums are the most common feature, collegiate golf courses are the second most common, and campus-based hotels are the least common. It should be noted that among AAU-member and “Public Ivy” PLGUs, these facilities are more prevalent than the general PLGU population. This is particularly so for hotel and golf course facilities.

![Table 18a. Summary of AAU-member PLGUs with hotel, museum, and golf facilities](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Golf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAU level IV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU level III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Golf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of AAU PLGUs, n=16</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLGUs in general (see Table 17)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 18b. Summary of “Public Ivy” PLGUs with hotel, museum, and golf facilities](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Golf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Ivy level IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Ivy level III</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Ivy level II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Golf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Public Ivy PLGUs, n=14</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLGUs in general (see Table 17)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceived value and prestige that hotel facilities bring to communities can vary widely depending on brand, construction (e.g., “green” vs. conventional), amenities, and a host of other factors (Butler, 2008). Golf courses, on the other hand, and the country club facilities that usually anchor them are widely accepted as bastions of the elite. Herein, golf course development is a land use strategy used globally to increase property values and tourism-related economic development in suburban and resort communities (Warnken et al, 2001). In particular, collegiate golf courses may be considered a part of the destination
placemaking, amenitization or even luxurification (to coin an equally clumsy yet fitting term) of university campuses. According to an article in *Links*, an online golf travel magazine:

... higher education has morphed from a scholarly vocation to a luxury consumer purchase. Competition for standout students has led to rock-climbing walls in the quadrangle and grinning administrators handing out iPods to every freshman in the registration line. Against this economic and cultural backdrop, golf has emerged as a unique and compelling (old-line educators will shudder at the word) amenity. Rock-climbing is a niche activity and electronics become obsolete, but the networking and par-shooting skills honed on a golf course can serve a graduate oh-so-well in the Fortune 500 career he or she anticipates.

Indeed, one of the planners for Purdue University’s Kampen Golf Course advises universities to think of themselves as “destination points” so that “they really can become great places” (Avery, 2011); assuming, of course, that universities are not great places already. Whether or not one agrees with this somewhat biased viewpoint, AAU-member and “Public Ivy” PLGUs appear to be on board as leaders of campus-based golf course development, as the data gathered here suggest. Though golf course development may be considered an elitist form of placemaking, it is being connected to placemaking nonetheless.

*Identifying potential facility clusters.*

As suggested by the Clemson University example described above, PLGUs that develop tourism-related facilities in clusters are positioned to market themselves as placemakers for the public good. In addition to the Kellogg Hotel and Conference Center, Michigan State University – a Level III capacity PLGU that also is a member of the AAU and is considered a “Public Ivy” – features the Henry Center Complex, a cluster of conference center, corporate-branded hotel, golf course, and recreation facilities (see Figure 15). While the Henry Center for Executive Development advances the university’s mission as an education and training venue (http://www.bus.msu.edu/edc/home.cfm) and the Forest Akers
Golf Course perhaps fulfills the land-grant public service mission by making golf accessible “to the public with memberships available to fit any budget,” (http://www.golfmsu.msu.edu/about), the intended function of the University Club of Michigan State University is somewhat less apparent, at least at first glance.

Billed as “a private membership club serving the social, business, dining and recreational needs of the greater Michigan State University and Lansing area community,” (2011c) the University Club was formed in 1929 as the State College Club and “was open to any interested male faculty member.” According to a detailed history outlined by the Club, “membership was expanded to include university alumni and community members” – with community not clearly defined – in the 1970s. By the turn of the 21st century, the Club merged with the City Club of Lansing (2011a), thus giving it the charge of “serving the university
mission, and facilitating positive town and gown relations” (2011c). Indeed, its website features a “Community Connections” page geared towards constructing a community and civic engagement image for the Club despite a history of excluding women, non-university affiliates, and perhaps other groups. Its introduction reads:

In every city, there has always been a certain place where influential people gather in comfortable surroundings – to conduct business, lay the groundwork for community projects, organize social and philanthropic events, or simply engage in agreeable conversation and camaraderie. For over 75 years, the University Club of Michigan State University has provided such an environment for the MSU campus and local communities - a gracious and distinguished setting in which town and gown come together, frequently shaping the future direction of the university and greater Lansing area. (2011d)

“Gracious” language notwithstanding, social exclusion – or, at least, preferential inclusion – appears to persist at the Club with “membership opportunities” that extend 50% off of initiation fees to new members who have been nominated by existing members (2011b).

Clearly, the University Club employs community engagement-oriented marketing language that, after one sifts through the not-so-subtle wink-and-nod tone of the passage, begs clarification on a few points. Who are considered “influential people”? Given that the University Club represents one of the “certain place[s]” that “every city” has (a rather presumptuous statement) where “influential people gather in comfortable surroundings” to “lay the groundwork for community projects,” does “influential people” include grassroots organization leaders, neighborhood activists, or even at-risk youth from the local community? Which aspects of “town and gown come together” in this environment and how is this interaction defined? A public health professor and members of her service learning course on aging populations with 50 or more local senior citizens in tow to enjoy a healthy local foods demonstration? Since the University Club claims to serve the institution’s mission – teaching, research, or public service, take your pick, dear reader – such a scenario might occur
if the professor has elected to take advantage of the Club’s now open membership policy. Furthermore, since the Club is part of a public land-grant institution that is mandated to serve communities statewide, might a 4-H cooperative extension specialist be permitted to invite youth from various Michigan communities to experience a weekend of recreation (the nearby Candlewood Suites hotel is available for extended stay)? Does such a scenario qualify as “facilitating positive town and gown relations”? Perhaps not, since they may not be considered “influential people” involved in “shaping the future direction of the university and greater Lansing area” (2011c, 2011d). Indeed, one can only speculate as to the community engagement intentions of the Club – and therein lies a source of possible conflict.

The University Club at Michigan State University example begins to illuminate some of the potential benefits and drawbacks of university involvement with tourism planning and development. Though the University Club does not claim to be a tourism-related entity, it is related to tourism through its reciprocal affiliation and spatial clustering with the Henry Center conference, hotel, and golf facilities. Like the Conference Center and Inn facility at Clemson University, the clustered facility at Michigan State ostensibly serves an array of clientele, from university faculty, staff, alumni, and students to members of the greater Lansing community to conference attendees from other states and possibly other countries. The simultaneous mingling of these various constituencies creates ongoing opportunities and risks for interpersonal interactions that can be positive or negative. Indeed, visitor interactions with local residents greatly influence destination image formation (Gunn, 2002; Moscardo, 2008).

Moreover, marketing plays a powerful role in destination image, and marketing language and images can be interpreted in various ways depending on the audience. As the foregoing textual analysis of the “Community Connections” webpage introduction suggests,
the inculcation of “town and gown” engagement language in the University Club’s web-based marketing may appeal to a noblesse oblige consumer on one hand (Club members are said to have raised $6,000 for needy families in the community); on the other hand, it may offend another type of consumer who detects local in-group and out-group power dynamics in the messaging. If the latter consumer has significant buying power or social influence, he and others like him may choose to vote with their feet and take their business elsewhere, thus inhibiting the appeal and overall competitiveness of the destination complex. While the University Club states that it is private, it yet maintains cooperative agreements with the Forest Akers Golf Course and Henry Center conference facility, both of which serve as public entities. This coalescing of public and private spaces can prove problematic for a hospitality complex ostensibly developed to welcome and serve local communities and visitors and operating under the banner of a PLGU that has public service as its mandate. Indeed, negative perceptions of or experiences with the University Club unit can extend to the hospitality complex, if not the entire institution.

Michigan State University is a member of Campus Compact with a decided commitment to community-engaged scholarship. Its faculty serve actively on editorial boards for the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (http://ginsberg.umich.edu/mjcsl/editors), the Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement (http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/about), and the Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship (http://www.jces.ua.edu/about/editorialBoard.html). The institution is a member of the National Outreach Scholarship Conference – along with other Level IV PLGUs including the University of Georgia, North Carolina State University, Penn State University, and Purdue University – and is scheduled to host the Conference’s annual meeting in October 2011 (http://www.outreachscholarship.org/). As this brief semiotic
critique has demonstrated, however, the use of community-engaged marketing within Michigan State University’s tourism-related complex may be communicating values, policies, power relations, and practices that oppose the institution’s broader community engagement agenda. This critique should not be viewed as isolated to this PLGU, as there are several others that match its tourism planning and development capacity profile.

Table 19 lists other PLGUs like Michigan State University that feature hotel, museum, and golf facilities according to capacity level. This list does not intend to suggest that each of the PLGU facilities have spatially clustered facilities; rather, it provides further insight into specific institutions within the identified levels that are characterized by what may be viewed as an additional form of tourism planning and development capacity. Based on the foregoing analysis of Michigan State University’s hospitality complex, these institutions could be foci of similar inquiry.

Table 19 reveals the following noteworthy patterns among PLGUs that feature hotel, museum, and golf course facilities.

Institutional types. Level IV and Level III capacity PLGUs dominate this group of 20 institutions, as they comprise 90% of the group. Twelve (60%) of the institutions in this group are AAU members. Of the 16 total AAU-member PLGUs, a majority (75%) are represented. Ten (50%) of the institutions in this group are “Public Ivy” PLGUs. Of the 14 total “Public Ivy” PLGUs, a majority (71%) are represented. These patterns further suggest association between perceived institutional prestige and PLGU tourism planning and development capacity.
Table 19. PLGUs featuring hotel, museum, and golf course facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. University of Georgia ♣ E</td>
<td>2. University of California System * ♣</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Purdue University (IN) * CC</td>
<td>3. University of Delaware ♣ CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Iowa State University *</td>
<td>4. University of Illinois-Urbana ♣</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cornell University (NY) ♣♣ E</td>
<td>5. Louisiana State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clemson University (SC) CC</td>
<td>6. Michigan State University * ♣ CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Texas A&amp;M University *</td>
<td>7. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey * ♣ E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University CC</td>
<td>8. Ohio State University * ♣ CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Penn State University * ♣</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. University of Wisconsin-Madison * ♣ CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ♣ - “Public Ivy” institution  
- ♣♣ - Ivy League institution  
- * - member of the Association of American Universities  
- E - institution named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification  
- CC - member of Campus Compact

Community engagement. Commitment to community engagement emerges as a shared characteristic among this group of institutions. Thirteen (65%) are Campus Compact members and five (25%) are designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Because these are elective affiliations, it is difficult to determine at this point in the analysis the extent to which these institutions are marketing their involvement with tourism planning and development as a form of community engagement. In the vein of the Michigan State
University analysis, phase III addresses community engagement marketing in more detail by reporting the results of visual survey and material analysis for applicable institutions.

**Summary of phase II analysis.**

Using the four primary mechanisms of tourism planning and development included in this study as observation points, a national inventory of 69 PLGUs was conducted. The inventory reveals five levels among these PLGUs that are reflective of their programming and networking capacity for tourism planning and development activity.

The analysis suggests association between high levels of tourism planning and development capacity and positive indicators for perceived institutional prestige. To draw any definitive conclusions regarding this association would be premature, at best, since a primary goal of this research project is to lay groundwork for further research. Association between perceived institutional prestige and tourism planning and development capacity is an observation at this point; statistically significant testing would be warranted to demonstrate it. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the vast majority of AAU-member PLGUs and so-called “Public Ivy” PLGUs – 100% and about 93%, respectively – populate the two highest capacity levels.

Level IV and Level III PLGUs tend to be affiliated with national professional organizations and scholarly networks more so than institutions within lower capacity levels. Such networks afford these PLGUs the opportunity to enhance further their programming and networking capacity for tourism planning and development activity. This suggests that once an institution attains a higher capacity level, it is likely to maintain it through specialized knowledge exchange networks that lower capacity institutions perhaps are unaware of or, if they are aware of them, either do not have the resources to invest in them or have determined
that they have no need to access them. While this assessment of lower capacity institutions is speculative at this point in the analysis, phase III may provide some insights regarding how representatives from lower capacity PLGUs view their involvement with tourism planning and development.

As mentioned in the introductory chapter to this study, a primary concern underlying this research is the idea that PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development empowers some institutions and disempowers others as placemakers in their communities. At this point in the analysis, the data suggest that PLGUs accorded with AAU membership and “Public Ivy” status are more likely to wield greater placemaking power in their towns, cities, and regions through tourism planning and development activity. This likely is the case for non-AAU member and non “Public Ivy” PLGUs that rank as Level IV and Level III capacity institutions.

Conversely, as tourism planning and development capacity levels decrease, the representation of historically black 1890 PLGUs increases. There is only one historically black PLGU that ranks among the Level III institutions. Of the Level II PLGUs, they represent 36% and of Level I, they represent 77%. All of the “N/A” capacity level PLGUs are 1890 schools. As a result, these institutions are less likely to wield placemaking power through tourism planning and development in surrounding communities. This should not suggest, however, that 1890 institutions do not have placemaking affects in their communities related to tourism or other areas. Indeed, a majority (66%) of the 1890 universities feature museum facilities that celebrate and preserve institutional and African-American history and culture. These facilities are considered attractions and gathering spaces for visitors and community members alike, particularly for family reunions. Moreover, 1890 PLGUs overall
demonstrate strong commitment to community engagement through paid memberships with Campus Compact.

Nevertheless, it appears that 1890 PLGUs by and large lack capacity to compete and, therefore, are competitively disadvantaged as higher capacity PLGUs appear to be advancing themselves as powerful placemakers that – as articulated by Clemson University – are generating economic and educational benefits for surrounding communities. This form of placemaking power may prove to be increasingly important as PLGUs and other higher education institutions are expected to demonstrate their contributions and worth to broader society. In particular, PLGUs that feature tourism facility clusters and complexes such as those identified at Clemson University and Michigan State University may very well be considered capacity “trendsetters” in this regard.

Analysis III: Who says it is tourism? Who says it is engagement? The marketing of PLGU tourism planning and development as placemaking

The analysis provided so far has addressed the study’s first research question and hypothesis regarding tourism planning and development capacity differences among PLGUs. The capacity levels identified in the phase II analysis provide a basis for phase III of the analysis which investigates further the tendency of higher capacity PLGUs to use place-based, community engagement-oriented images and language in their tourism planning and development marketing.

As mentioned in the introduction to this study, there is debate within higher education circles regarding whether or not universities should be involved with tourism planning and development in the first place. A respondent at Rutgers University who sees the importance of such involvement remarked:
We are Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. . . . We educate students, we do research, we provide outreach. . . . what remains is the fact that we are the land-grant [university in New Jersey] with that tripartite mission. Again, we could excel exclusively on student instruction, but we would be failing in our mission. We could do wonderful research only, but we would be failing in our mission. . . . I personally see tourism planning as a subset of economic development planning. I don’t see any conflict with that. . . . I don’t put very narrow bounds on what Rutgers or universities should or shouldn’t do. Should we be investing hard dollars into developing an amusement park here at Rutgers? No, I don’t think that’s our priority. Things that are within our mission that have the potential expanded benefit of engaging the public for educational or recreational purposes? I think that’s valid. We have a tremendous amount of cultural assets. We have a geology museum. We have an art museum. We have arts. Why do we have these public exhibitions if we’re not implicitly saying that we want to extend these benefits to the public? It’s not just for Rutgers students, faculty, or staff. I see no conflict there. (Cooperative extension faculty member, personal communication, Mar 30, 2011)

On the opposing side, another respondent from Rutgers questioned the value of universities being linked with tourism planning and development at all:

Universities are supposed to be educating people. Its main constituency is students. I’m not saying that putting on events for people to come and enjoy cultures is problematic – that’s part of the university’s mission, I suppose – but it is peripheral. The mission is not to draw people from Iowa to come enjoy the delights of our community. Yes, we have concert series, we have theatres, but that’s more town-gown. I think the university should be part of the community. It should be helping the community. From my perspective, the community has many more needs more urgent than tourists. I think educating its kids and providing jobs for the residents are more important. (Rutgers university faculty member, personal communication, Jan 21, 2011)

Despite these opposing viewpoints, there is evidence that PLGUs – particularly Level IV and Level III PLGUs – are framing their involvement with tourism planning and development as public service. The study’s phase II analysis discussed Clemson University and Michigan State University as specific examples. Are there others?

*Level IV and Level III PLGU tourism planning and development marketing.*

Based on the second guiding hypothesis for this study, I conducted visual and textual
analyses of cooperative extension tourism, conference and event services, and campus visitor information center websites at Level IV and Level III capacity institutions. As suggested in the phase II analysis, Level IV and Level III PLGUs are quite similar with regard to observed tourism planning and development capacity and other characteristics (i.e., perceived prestige, capacity enhancements). The website analysis for these institutions is reported in the same section for this reason.

Table 20 reports observations of tourism planning and development themes that were documented. It includes the total number of websites where tourism planning and development themes were observed. Themes in bold type are so-called sustainable forms of tourism that I expected to find promoted by each mechanism. As Table 20 indicates, language and images promoting cultural heritage and nature tourism were observed among all three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism planning and development themes</th>
<th>Cooperative extension tourism websites, n=37</th>
<th>Conference and event services websites, n=34</th>
<th>Campus visitor information center websites, n=34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agritourism (rural tourism)</td>
<td>25 (67%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building and collaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community tourism planning and development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage tourism</td>
<td>14 (38%)</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development; economic impact analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/eco tourism</td>
<td>17 (46%)</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports tourism</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor service and experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mechanisms. Agritourism and any other forms of rural tourism were found to be promoted through cooperative extension tourism websites only, which is reflective of PLGUs’ historic agricultural service mandate. Nature tourism was found to be promoted at fairly similar rates between cooperative extension tourism and conference and event services websites, and at a considerably lower rate among campus visitor information centers.

Interestingly, cultural heritage tourism promotion among conference and event services websites exceeded the other two mechanisms. This may suggest that conference and event services – particularly at prestigious AAU-member and “Public Ivy” Level IV and Level III PLGUs – tend to target market to an affluent clientele for large conferences, corporate trainings, weddings, and other special events. This does not mean that these conference and event services departments do not host community-based (e.g., small nonprofit) events as well. Based on first-hand knowledge of the profession, I have observed that conference and event services departments that maintain a well-balanced and diversified portfolio of clients are more likely to be sustained through a combination of revenue and word-of-mouth referrals, the latter of which can make community-based interactions quite valuable. Nevertheless, more affluent clients can help these departments to achieve immediate financial goals, so if promoting cultural heritage-oriented products and experiences (e.g., local museums, theater performances, restaurants) helps to attract their business, cultural heritage then becomes a prominent promotional feature. This perhaps explains the comparatively lower rates of cultural heritage tourism promotion found among cooperative extension tourism programs – which appear to be preserving PLGU extension’s agricultural heritage with a host of 21st century value-added spins – and campus visitor information centers, which appear to
cater primarily to prospective students and their families, though not in all cases.

Overall, this cursory analysis provides a sense of Level IV and Level III PLGUs’ promotional use of what are considered sustainable forms of tourism. Indeed, one might expect to find greater promotion of sports tourism among these mechanisms, particularly among campus visitor information centers that attempt to appeal to prospective undergraduate students. Yet, sports tourism promotion is not a salient feature. Perhaps sports tourism is not perceived as having as much educational value as nature, cultural heritage, and agritourism forms. Moreover, sports tourism promotion may be viewed as more appropriately handled by university athletic departments or even local CVBs. The sections below provide additional insights regarding marketing themes observed within each mechanism.

*Level IV and Level III cooperative extension tourism.*

For both Level IV and Level III institutions, cooperative extension tourism websites were found to have the most consistent occurrences of community-engaged images and language pertaining to tourism. Due to the history of cooperative extension, it is not surprising that there is a marked emphasis on agritourism, a form of rural tourism that is being promoted as a value-added income diversification strategy for farmers. Somewhat related to agritourism in the cooperative extension realm are cultural heritage and nature tourism, both of which represent quite prevalent planning and development emphases as well. While rural, cultural heritage, and nature tourism appear to be the most common types of tourism that are promoted among Level IV and Level III cooperative extension programs, there are other areas of tourism that emerged as well (see Table 20). Below are examples of some Level IV and Level III institutions that are engaging in these diverse and sometimes overlapping activities with particular emphasis on collaboration among PLGUs and local, regional, and state entities.
Ohio State University Extension provides the Ohio Tourism Toolbox (see Figure 16), “a one-stop resource for industry professionals and community leaders” created by the Ohio Tourism Team which includes a diverse cross-section of tourism planning and policy stakeholders from throughout the state – including Ohio Travel Association; Ohio Department of Agriculture; Bowling Green State University; and various municipal and county CVBs – as well as relevant entities within the university. The web portal appears to address the needs and interests of a broad constituency, from tourism educators and researchers to residents who are interested in developing tourism in their communities. The integration of various components of tourism planning and development – including CVB partnership opportunities, business development guidance, civic advocacy and legal information, and festival and event management resources – suggests significant breadth and depth of programming and networking capacity on the institution’s part.

Figure 16. Homepage of the Ohio Tourism Toolbox, a web-portal created and hosted by Ohio State University Extension in collaboration with statewide tourism partners. Available at http://ohiotourism.osu.edu/, accessed July 2, 2011.
• The cooperative extension tourism departments at Clemson University, a Level IV PLGU, and the University of Illinois, a Level III PLGU, partner to offer the Pee Dee Agritourism Passport, a web-based marketing portal advertising a variety of agritourism businesses and attractions in the northeastern Pee Dee region of South Carolina. The portal promotes farmers markets, agricultural festivals, pick-your-own farm experiences, farm-based bed and breakfast inns, and a farm-based agriculture museum. A Clemson representative stated that its program has “more off- than on-campus” collaborations. On-campus collaborators include Clemson’s Parks, Recreation and Tourism Department; off-campus collaborators include “area chambers [of commerce], local governments, city and county councils, workforce investment boards, and the South Carolina State Department of Tourism” with whom the university recently completed a “kitchen incubator” project to stimulate the development of small culinary businesses. University of Illinois Extension was mentioned as an external partner as well (Personal communication, May 15, 2011).

• North Carolina State University Tourism Extension is tied to the institution’s academic Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management program. As such, Tourism Extension offers an array of educational and training programs including the University Consortium Certificate (UCC) in Sustainable Tourism; the NC Birder Friendly training program in partnership with Audubon North Carolina; the East Coast Agritourism Series with Rutgers University Cooperative Extension; and onsite agritourism workshops held in partnership with the University of Georgia’s Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development. Working in collaboration with a Level III PLGU and Level IV PLGU, respectively, its “engagement and economic development
programs recognize the importance of tourism,” thus “allow[ing] Tourism Extension to be a partner in planning, developing, and growing sustainable tourism and recreation resources across North Carolina.”

*Cooperative tourism extension as one-way community outreach.*

Several survey phone interview respondents were confident that cooperative tourism extension advances the public service mission of PLGUs. Interestingly, the comments suggest an overall tendency towards outreach modes of service rather than two-way community engagement, which perhaps speaks to an enduring one-way knowledge transfer culture and mentality within cooperative extension (Sandmann and Weerts, 2008). Language that suggests faculty and extension agents helping to take or provide resources to communities of need is subtle yet pervasive.

Definitely, especially in our rural communities. As a university professor, I am providing the types of services they need to increase tourism in their communities. These communities do not have professional staff to do that. (Academic and extension faculty member, personal communication, May 17, 2011)

Tourism is a vital part of the community and we help to support it by providing educational outreaches to the sector. (County extension agent, personal communication, May 18, 2011)

Yes. We get lots of public relations for the university, and we appear on television very frequently. It’s a visible program. Because we have been hit hard due to the economic downturn, we have been losing many manufacturing jobs. Our program is helping economic developers at the state level to focus on cultural heritage tourism as a workforce development strategy. (Assistant director of cooperative extension, personal communication, May 17, 2011)

Absolutely. We began a new program for high school juniors and seniors who are from a working farm or ranch family. The students spend one week on campus where they are exposed to economics, and we take them on field trips to successful farms and ranches. I teach agritourism to the students. (4H county extension representative, personal communication, May 18, 2011)

---

Cooperative extension tourism takes university knowledge to rural areas. It helps to build capacity. (Cooperative extension faculty member, Personal communication, May 16, 2011)

Yes, with our being a land-grant, it fits into the mission. Extension work has traditionally focused on rural areas and counties. We realize the importance of working with urban areas as well. (Cooperative extension faculty member, personal communication, May 19, 2011)

The purpose is to assist entrepreneurs in achieving their goals, to diversify agricultural income, to bring in tourism. It’s a growing demand. We just held a symposium for planning commissioners and county planners. It was an eye opener for them because they did not understand the definition of agritourism, the types of businesses in agritourism and its impact on local economies. We also work with entrepreneurs on business planning, marketing strategies and collaborating with others. (County extension agent, personal communication, May 16, 2011)

*Un-“cooperative” realities of cooperative extension tourism.*

While the projects mentioned above may seem collaborative, it bears mentioning that there are not-so-cooperative aspects to cooperative extension tourism. As phone survey interviews revealed, cooperative extension tourism has experienced significant funding issues over the past few years in light of the Great Recession of the late 2000s. Below are comments that reflect a range of reactions, from conciliatory adaptation to outright frustration, that have resulted from budget cuts, as well as power struggles and political undermining that can intensify during times of resource scarcity. It must be noted that respondents shared their insights under conditions of strict confidentiality; therefore, some comments have been edited to protect their identities.

We could do more if we had more resources. We are using students more on projects. It requires more work but it is a good thing. (Extension faculty member, personal communication, May 16, 2011)

Ten years ago, there was a robust agritourism program. The funds have dried up now. We are not a visible program area anymore. [in a frustrated, almost exasperated tone] There has been nothing in the past five years. If we were doing it like we were before, we could really be helping some communities. We no longer have any formal ties to
community outreach on this campus. (County extension agent, personal communication, May 16, 2011)

We probably need to do more. Extension has always been about agriculture. Even with our deans now, it’s different. [pauses and sighs] The Western US is doing much more than the Eastern U.S., although North Carolina is doing some things. I am all by myself in my state and would love to have some help. (Extension faculty member, personal communication, May 19, 2011)

[In a tone of slight worry] The county offices are merging. There will be the local county office with three other offices so that it will be a four-county extension office. This is due to budget cuts and it is happening throughout the state. (Director of extension, personal communication, May 18, 2011)

The office that handles the extension, community engagement, and economic development efforts at our university is being disbanded due to budget cuts and the services will be consolidated. (Associate director of extension, personal communication, May 17, 2011)

These complaints perhaps foreshadow some of the drawbacks of university involvement in tourism planning and development, particularly community power conflict and inhibited place competitiveness. These issues can arise with administrative and/or policy changes within universities or the political climate of states. If community partners and stakeholders are not apprised or simply do not understand why extension tourism services no longer are being offered, trust building efforts between PLGUs and the communities that they are attempting to engage could be jeopardized.

*Level IV and Level III conference and event services.*

As suggested previously, conference and event services has emerged as a viable revenue stream for many colleges and universities throughout the U.S. Based on phase I analysis findings for this study, this is likely the case among PLGUs, as 73% of them feature a conference and event services department. Of the 51 PLGUs that feature this mechanism, 34
or roughly 66% are Level IV and Level III capacity institutions. Thus, the conference and event services mechanism is well-represented among these higher capacity level institutions.

In addition, conference and event services departments at Level IV and III PLGUs tend to have partnerships with external tourism organizations. The 23 PLGUs that were found to have relationships with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entities all are Level IV and Level III institutions. Assuming that PLGU conference and event services departments target clients who tend to consume cultural heritage and nature tourism, such relationships can generate cooperative marketing opportunities that can be quite valuable. Herein, community engagement may be viewed more so as a business strategy than as a way to fulfill the public service mission of the university. Below are a few examples lifted from PLGU conference and event services websites that incorporate place marketing language:

- Conference Planning and Management at Iowa State University is housed within University Extension. This Level IV capacity institution uses a place-based marketing slogan “Ames and ISU – A Winning Combination,” thus promoting the university and the surrounding community as a unified product:

  Ames and Iowa State University are one of the premiere university-based convention and meeting destinations in the United States. . . . The campus has grabbed attention by being considered one of the 25 most beautiful in the United States and is one of only three to make the American Society of Landscape Architect’s centennial listing of “Medallion Site.”

- The University of Maine’s Conference Services Division website provides links to the Downtown Bangor Partnership for downtown revitalization and the Greater Bangor

---

CVB. It dovetails the educational mission of this Level III institution with community engagement in its promotional language thusly:

The Conference Services Division furthers the academic mission of the University of Maine by bringing together groups of participants and qualified resource people to share information and ideas, to develop new skills, and insights, and to find solutions to current problems. It accomplishes this by professionally coordinating a varied and rich selection of conferences, meetings, seminars, and symposia annually, thereby showcasing the University’s facilities and resources through its research and educational endeavors. [It] provide[s] professional expertise in the areas of conference/meeting design and facilitation planning, programming, and coordination to sponsors of educationally focused events by strengthening the connection with business, professional organizations and communities throughout Maine. 28

- University Conferences and Catering at the University of New Hampshire, a Level IV capacity PLGU, employs copious use of place marketing language on its website. Its message clearly targets visitors who seek an authentic – if not romanticized – New England experience with historic, cultural, and culinary emphases:

Located in historic Durham on the University of New Hampshire campus, we offer more than just a great place to host an event. With the spectacular seacoast minutes away, shopping in Portsmouth nearby and the world-renowned White Mountains a short drive from campus, you will have the best of New England at your fingertips. The New Hampshire seacoast is a very special place that blends the past, present and future harmoniously to create a wonderful mix of cultures, breathtaking scenery and food that comes fresh from the dock and crisp from the garden. Whether you're new to the area or a seasoned local, New Hampshire always has something exciting to offer. For more information about the sites, sounds and tastes that make our location so delightful click here.29

28 See the University of Maine Conference Services Division’s “Welcome to Conference Services Division” webpage, available at http://www.umaine.edu/conferences/, accessed April 2, 2011.
The “click here” link directs browsers to a “Location and Destinations” webpage that lists seven “Top Local Destinations” and offers to help clients “plan a variety of day-trips and outings” including “a trip to New Hampshire’s seashore and mountains, shopping in Portsmouth or even a tour of downtown Boston” (see Figure 17).

Indeed, some of the language used in the University of New Hampshire example may be viewed as a bit superfluous and the activities slightly inappropriate in light of the university’s core teaching, research, and public service missions. Arguably, however, such florid advertising could evoke positive images of New Hampshire in an event planner’s mind and inspire him to consider hosting a conference there. If he does, as the passage suggests,
seaside, mountain, and urban communities throughout the state could accrue economic benefits. It may be a stretch, but the university would be providing a benefit to the state through such activity (a la the Wisconsin Idea) while augmenting its own revenue. In this scenario, the University of New Hampshire – and other PLGUs of a similar ilk – becomes a placemaker through tourism, reciprocally enhancing the economic competitiveness and image of surrounding communities that it is mandated to serve.

*A Wisconsin Idea gone wrong?*

Though PLGU conference and event services departments may contribute to place competitiveness and positive destination image enhancement, there are potential drawbacks as well, as indicated in this study’s third guiding hypothesis.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison may be a case study in internal power struggles that can result from duplication of services and that have a ripple effect in the surrounding community. This Level III capacity PLGU reportedly has four separate conference and event services offices, perhaps more than any other PLGU except the University of California system. According to a retired university employee, each office at one time or another had its own relationship with the Greater Madison CVB. Two of the offices no longer have relationships with the CVB due to an enduring perception that the other two offices were receiving preferential treatment from the community partner through more business referrals.

The Campus Event Services Office reports to the Dean of Social Education. They make their own money. They’re unique in that manner. They have two buildings on campus, and they have no marketing partnership with the CVB. CALS Conference Service is no longer involved with the CVB. They joined several years ago, but they pulled out because it was said that the CVB did more referrals to UW Extension’s conference services area than they did to CALS. So, CALS decided to cut that relationship from the budget when the budget became tight. CALS is based in the College Agriculture and reports to the Associate Dean for Extension and College of Agriculture. The Pyle Center is the conference center run by UW Extension. They have a strong partnership with the CVB, and they do advertising for each other. This
office reports to the Vice Chancellor for Administration. The Division of Housing and Conference Event Services also continues to have a cooperative marketing partnership with the CVB. They report to Housing. They work with summer groups, and they house them at the dorms. (Former academic and extension faculty member, personal communication, May 5, 2011)

Universities tend to be quite bureaucratic organizations with complex reporting structures. As a consequence, universities are prone to internal power struggles based on turf conflict, especially due to strong, independent departmental cultures and weaker institutional affiliation among departments (Rhodes, 2001; Taylor, 2010). However, when such struggles extend to community partners in tourism engagement scenarios, this can adversely impact relationships and, therein, compromise a unit’s networking capacity. In this brief University of Wisconsin case, only time will tell if the Pyle Center and the Division of Housing and Conference Event Services will fare better economically than the Campus Event Services Office and CALS through their respective CVB partnerships.

*Level IV and Level III campus visitor information centers.*

As mentioned previously, involvement with tourism is least salient among campus visitor information centers at Level IV and Level III PLGUs. This likely is due to the fact that the primary audience for campus visitor information centers is prospective undergraduate students. As one campus visitor information professional observed, budgetary concerns substantiate this “narrow” approach with the drawback of limiting what campus visitor information centers can become:

The field has begun to see a lot more growth in membership coming from undergraduate admissions/enrollment management operations where the visitors center has moved back under that operation. Now, to be quite honest with you, I have found that to be relatively disappointing because it limits the potential for what those visitors centers can do because the core mission has become much more narrow, being much more about prospective students. So even though they will tell you that they are not, they don’t really end up focusing on including alumni, parents, current students,
visiting faculty, or all of the other people who generally are generating flow and visits to the campus community. . . . the limited resources that are specifically affecting state institutions and the fact that these programs have been growing at about the same time, decisions had to be made about what they could really do and where resources could be placed. It is coming down to that financial decision: it is worth building a several million dollar visitors center if you are going to improve the chances of more prospective students coming to the institution. . . . but I can also see that once and if we get through this economic tumult that all of higher education is experiencing, then people may rethink that and see that there could be a broader perspective to all of this. (CIVSA officer, personal communication, Aug 24, 2010)

A broader perspective for campus visitor information centers involves creating linkages with local and state tourism entities. While evidence of this activity is found to be least apparent among the campus visitor information center websites reviewed for this study, there still is evidence nonetheless based on these reviews, as well as phone survey interview responses.

- The University of Arizona Visitor Center, which reports to the Office of Community Relations, is a member of the Tucson Metropolitan CVB. Its website features a downloadable University of Arizona Visitor Guide webpage that markets the university as “a premier destination for visitors to the Southwest” and features a downloadable visitor guide.\(^{30}\) The Visitor Center and the CVB carry each other’s visitor guides and brochures (University of Arizona Visitor Center representative, personal communication, May 16, 2011). The University of Arizona is a Level III capacity institution. Purdue University, a Level IV capacity institution, also distributes a visitors guide through its Visitor Center (see Figure 12b, p. 120). The Visitor Center has a partnership with the West Lafayette/Lafayette CVB which involves publication exchanges and cooperative marketing (Purdue University Visitor Center representative, personal communication, May 19, 2011).

\(^{30}\) The University of Arizona Visitor Guide is available at http://wc.arizona.edu/ads/visitorguide/, accessed April 4, 2011.
• The University of Maryland – College Park’s Visitor Center is integrated with its conference and event services department, thus giving it the title Conferences and Visitor Services. This Level III capacity PLGU features an online visitor guide through University Visitors Network, a national web portal for prospective college students. Despite an emphasis on undergraduate admissions, the department considers itself “the CVB for the University community” due to its integrated mission of appealing to prospective students as well as visitors and of marketing to prospective conference event services clients (University of Maryland – College Park Visitor Center representative, personal communication, May 3, 2011).

• Washington State University’s Visitor Center is a member of the local chamber of commerce. The chamber is considered the CVB of Pullman, WA. They exchange maps and other collateral material. Visitor Center staff members make regular presentations at chamber meetings to discuss how to continually maximize the value of their partnership (Washington State University Visitor Center representative, personal communication, May 5, 2011).

_A model Wisconsin Idea under debate_

As mentioned previously, the University of Wisconsin-Madison features two campus-based information centers: the UW Campus Information Center which serves an admissions function for prospective students and their families and the UW Welcome Center which serves visitors and tourists in partnership with the Greater Madison CVB. According to a board member with CIVSA, the university’s Visitor & Information Programs unit is considered a successful model due to its capacity to engage both constituencies:
There is a lot of discussion about, well, we are two different things: information centers and visitor centers. . . . there isn’t a difference. You have got to provide information if you are a visitor center and if you are an information center, you have got to help the visitors. The most successful programs provide both. A good example of that is the University of Wisconsin-Madison. They eventually took their armory on campus – it wasn’t meant for the University of Wisconsin, but the national guard had left it. It was an historic structure that was converted into a visitors center on the first floor and the information center was moved there to run it. Then, they put the admissions and cashier offices on the floor above it. It became a real central place. It was so successful that immediately the University of Wisconsin opened a second visitors center because there was such a demand, and they found themselves taking on the role of answering questions for visitors to Madison. (Personal communication, Sept 2, 2011)

**Level II and Level I PLGU tourism planning and development marketing.**

Collectively, Level II and Level I PLGUs are involved with tourism planning and development to a lesser extent than Level IV and Level III PLGUs simply because they do not have the diverse combinations of mechanisms that Level IV and III institutions have. Nevertheless, visual and textual reviews of these websites were conducted. Table 21 summarizes the findings, followed by brief discussions of each mechanism with regard to the extent that Level II and Level I PLGUs market themselves as engaged placemakers through tourism planning and development.

Table 21 reports observations of tourism planning and development themes that were documented. As with Table 20, it includes the total number of websites where tourism planning and development themes were observed. Language and images promoting cultural heritage tourism were observed across all three mechanisms, and most commonly among cooperative extension tourism websites and conference and event services websites. The marketing of nature tourism was found to occur primarily among conference and event services websites, with lesser promotion among cooperative extension tourism websites and no promotion at all among campus visitor information websites. As with Level IV and Level
III PLGUs, agritourism was found to be marketed through cooperative extension tourism websites only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism planning and development themes</th>
<th>Cooperative extension tourism websites, n=9</th>
<th>Conference and event services websites, n= 9</th>
<th>Campus visitor information center websites, n=6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agritourism (rural tourism)</td>
<td>8 (88%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building and collaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community tourism planning and development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage tourism</td>
<td>5 (55%)</td>
<td>5 (55%)</td>
<td>1 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development; economic impact analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/eco tourism</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>6 (66%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor service and experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Level II and Level I cooperative extension tourism.*

As with Level IV and Level III institutions, cooperative extension tourism websites among Level II and Level I were found to have the most consistent occurrences of community-engaged images and language pertaining to tourism. There proved to be an emphasis on agritourism among these institutions’ cooperative extension tourism programs as well. Again, given historical ties between cooperative extension and agriculture, this is to be expected.

Cultural heritage and nature tourism promotion and resource themes were found as well, with the former being more prevalent than the latter. Other tourism planning and
development topic areas emerged as well – although with less variety than Level IV and Level III institutions – including economic development, community capacity building and collaboration, and visitor satisfaction.

Level II and Level I cooperative extension tourism program websites were found to have some of the rudimentary components of their Level IV and Level III counterparts. In general, Level II and Level I extension tourism programs provide basic agritourism, cultural heritage tourism, and nature tourism resources and project overviews, though not as graphically sophisticated and expansive in content as the Ohio Tourism Toolbox, North Carolina State University Extension Tourism, and the University of Minnesota Tourism Center websites.

Based on feedback from phone survey interviews, the primary difference between this group and the higher capacity institutions is the nature of their engagement with external entities, or lack thereof. Indeed, none of the Level II and Level I institutions were found to be active participants in the 2010 National Extension Tourism Conference. Moreover, as a group, expressed partnerships with external tourism entities were found to be uneven.

The following are examples of activities being carried out by Level II and Level I cooperative extension tourism programs.

- Kansas State University’s cooperative extension tourism resources take the form of a downloadable list of agritourism businesses in South Central Kansas, “only minutes away from Wichita.” The list features over 30 farm experiences ranging from farmers’ markets to pick-your-own orchards. Romanticism of a rural life that everyman can recall is the marketing hook employed by this website, as the introductory passage reads:
Most of us have a farm somewhere in our family history. The memories of the glorious sunsets, the taste of a fresh peach, and the relaxation on the porch swing with a glass of freshly brewed tea are hard to forget. The escape from the stress of work, traffic, and television are only minutes away with a visit to one of the following agritourism locations.31

Indeed, nostalgia is a salient theme: as of this writing, the list of agritourism businesses has not been updated since July 2008, which suggests that the program may not be as much of a priority as it perhaps once was. When asked about external partnerships, aside from relationships with farmers, the Kansas State respondent did not mention any other community-based collaboration efforts (County extension agent, personal communication, May 16, 2011).

- West Virginia State University Extension’s Gus R. Douglass Institute for Agricultural, Consumer, Environmental, and Outreach Programs reports some interesting agritourism and nature-based tourism initiatives on its website. While it is a Level I capacity PLGU, this historically black 1890 school appears to be doing as much, if not more, innovative programming as its counterparts. As part of its Rural Business Services program, which is funded by the US Department of Agriculture’s 1890 Land Grant Colleges and Universities Initiative, the Institute spearheaded the Southern West Virginia Quilt Trail Projects in counties throughout the region. The project entailed wooden quilt squares being “hung on structures marking places of interest (historical sites and agritourism attractions) around the county and making a trail through the county.”32 In 2008, the Institute was involved in transplanting an Ireland-based “sustainable tourism” model called Greenbox to West Virginia. The primary thrust behind this initiative appears to be the Institute’s involvement with a statewide


creative economies project called CreateWV. Potential benefits to West Virginia rural communities also served as a likely impetus, as this optimistic passage suggests:

Some examples of Ireland’s sustainable tourism offerings that could be duplicated in West Virginia included archaeology holidays where travelers observe ancient burial ruins; health and wellness retreats including yoga; organic gardening and cooking training including information and demonstrations of organic growing, farming, and hands-on cooking courses; cycling holidays for adventurous travelers to experience the extensive trail systems around lakes, rivers, passing through dense woods and country parks. An exciting cultural program called “Arts in the Greenbox” lets tourists experience museums, festivals, poetry, music, performance, and literary arts. Families wanting to see nature first hand can take part in mountain climbing, exploring caves, boat trips, water sports, and fishing. West Virginia could easily create these same sustainable low-impact tourist attractions.33

While replicating the Greenbox concept sounds attractive, there is no evidence that any aspect of it has yet come to fruition. Because a representative at the Institute could not be reached for a survey phone interview, one can only speculate that perhaps with the country in the grips of the Great Recession in 2008, the timing was not right for launching a new tourism project, be it sustainable or not.

*Level II and Level I conference and event services.*

As previously indicated, 66% of the PLGUs that feature conference and event services are Level IV and Level III capacity institutions. Thus, Level II and Level I institutions are in the minority with regard to managing these kinds of operations. Moreover, out of the 20 Level II and Level I institutions, 5 (25%) participate in capacity enhancement activities, leaving the majority without programming and networking capacity resources to help their operations to remain competitive and abreast of national trends and innovations. Moreover, of the ten Level

---

II and Level I institutions that have conference and event services operations, only three were found to have relationships with external tourism entities.

As some of the examples below suggest, there appears to be a general tendency among Level II and Level I PLGUs to focus on promoting departmental services and campus venues rather than situating them in a broader community, place-based context. This general characteristic is subtle; yet, over time, campus facility-oriented marketing could prove problematic for these institutions and the communities that they are mandated to serve.

- The Kellogg Hotel and Conference Center at Tuskegee University, a Level I institution, is managed by Conference USA-FLK International, an external corporation. Herein, the Center operates independently of the university’s reporting structure. Though its image-rich website provides links to “Area Attractions” (http://www.tuskegeekelloggcenter.com/area_attractions.html) that include campus-based points of interest, the website focuses primarily on meeting and lodging space and services within the Center. Tuskegee may very well receive land lease revenue from the arrangement; however, the phone survey interview respondent for this 1890 PLGU did not specify. Were it not for the presence of the Kellogg Hotel and Conference Center, Tuskegee would be ranked among the seven other 1890 schools that comprise the tourism planning and development “N/A” level identified in this study.

- Florida A&M University, another 1890 PLGU, appears to have a conference services unit within its University Housing division. However, there is little online evidence to support its existence at this Level II institution except a downloadable “University Housing Conference Housing Agreement” form that is entirely contractual with no campus- or place-based marketing spin at all.
The University of Wyoming was found to have a conference and event services department only, making it a Level I PLGU. Based on online research, the institution’s Residence Life and Dining Services division apparently oversees this operation. With no images displayed, its marketing language is among the most basic encountered during this analysis process:

If you are considering hosing [sic] a conference at UW, Residence Life & Dining Services can help you in meeting your housing and dining needs. We also have some meeting and event space that could potentially accommodate your group. To get started with your planning, please consider the planning guidelines below.34

According to a respondent from the university, the conference services office at the University of Wyoming is no longer in existence due to budget cuts. This may be an unfortunate loss to that region’s cultural heritage tourism and ecotourism development efforts. Due to its central location in the Great Plains, the university could be promoted as an important destination node for hosting conferences and events that help to advance awareness of the region’s significance to American heritage.

*UConn: A prestigious and anomalous Level II PLGU.*

The University of Connecticut rates as a Level II capacity PLGU due to its lack of an academic tourism program and a cooperative extension tourism presence. As the sole “Public Ivy” among the Level II institutions, its Conference Services division has characteristics similar to Level III and even Level IV institutions. The Conference Services division maintains membership with Unique Venues and ACCED-I, two of the tourism capacity enhancements documented in this study. As an indication of seamless customer service

34 Website for the conference services area within Residence Life and Dining Services at University of Wyoming is available at http://www.uwyo.edu/reslife-dining/conferences/conference-services-reservations.html, accessed March 15, 2011.
capacity, the division’s website features an ACCED-I One Stop Certification logo, an apparently exclusive designation bestowed upon university conference and event services operations that efficiently address client service needs through “one contact, one contract, and one bill.” (see Figure 18)  


The ACCED-I One Stop designation suggests that within the higher education conference and event services profession, a premium has been placed on streamlined, integrated service clustering as a capacity enhancement and, thus, as a brand-worthy benefit to

---

35 For more information about the ACCED-I Certified One-Stop Shop program, see http://www.acced-i.org/onestop/mp.htm#faq, accessed March 17, 2011.
consumers and service providers (and, quite likely, ACCED-I as well, with other institutions ostensibly clamoring to invest whatever is necessary to secure the designation). Table 22 lists the seven PLGU conference service websites that were found bearing the ACCED-I One Stop Certification logo. With ties to the campus-based Nathan Hale Inn and Conference Center – which features links to area attractions on its website (http://www.nathanhaleinn.com/destination/index.cfm) – and a prominently displayed homepage link announcing the department’s partnership with the Greater Hartford CVB, University of Connecticut Conference Services is the only Level II operation that may be perceived as substantially comparable to a Level III or Level IV conference and event services department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLGU</th>
<th>Tourism planning and development capacity level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut-Storrs</td>
<td>Level II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>Level III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Level IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-College Park</td>
<td>Level III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
<td>Level III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>Level IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>Level III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. PLGUs designated with ACCED-I One Stop Certification

*Note: Based on website reviews only*

*Level II and Level I campus visitor information centers.*

Of the 9 Level II and Level I campus visitor information centers, one has evidence of cultural heritage tourism promotion (see subsequent profile section on Fort Valley State University). Some of the other centers are primarily admissions-focused while a couple of the centers have functions that are not quite clear.
• The University of Connecticut’s Lodewick Visitors Center (http://visitors.uconn.edu/index.php), the University of Rhode Island Visitor Center (http://www.uri.edu/admission/visiting.html), and the Oregon State University Visitor Center (http://oregonstate.edu/visitosu/index.php) all typify admissions-oriented visitor service programs. They provide campus tours for prospective students and their families, host open house admissions programs, and facilitate informational sessions regarding academic programs and undergraduate student life at their respective universities. As Level II capacity institutions, it is unlikely that serving community visitors is viewed as being within these visitor centers’ scope. Delaware State University, a Level II PLGU and historically black 1890 school, has a Welcome Center that reports to the Office of Admissions as well; however, the Welcome Center has no website. Based on an online campus map that illustrates the Welcome Center as a facility situated at the entrance to the campus (http://archives.desu.edu/dsu/mapnonjs.html), it likely is little more than a guard house.

• South Dakota State University is counted among the Level I PLGUs in this study based on evidence that a visitor center is being constructed at the institution’s botanical gardens. At first glance, the McCrory Gardens Education and Visitor Center perhaps does not conform to the predominant visitor center model that this study examines. Its primary mission is not student recruitment, although its programming certainly may yield undergraduate applications. It does not appear to target general visitors to the university or Brookings, SD, though it occupies a land tract that straddles a community commercial district and campus proper. Thus, McCrory Gardens is positioned to draw both types of visitors. The McCrory Gardens Education
and Visitor Center apparently aims to fulfill the university’s public service, research, and education mission by providing a campus-community gathering space for use by diverse constituencies:

The building will serve an educational role with its classrooms, lecture hall, and outdoor laboratory, and [Martin] Maca [associate director of planning and development at McCrory Gardens] said the center will play an important role in continuing education for a wide range of groups.

“We see this center not only as a unique capstone to the existing gardens and arboretum, but as a place where groups as varied as Extension Master Gardeners to public school classes can come to use the facility’s excellent classrooms and spaces,” Maca said. “In addition, it gives visitors an excellent starting point to their explorations of the grounds.” . . .

“This new center can provide space for Extension Master Gardener classes and other Extension programs, and be a place where workshops, continuing education classes, and other education goals can be achieved,” said [Barry] Dunn [South Dakota Corn Utilization Council Endowed Dean of SDSU’s College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences]. “It can also be an off-campus site for SDSU classes to visit, as well as a community-centered location for events, gatherings, banquets, weddings, conferences, and family or class reunions.” (South Dakota State University, 2011)

Potential linkages to tourism development are suggested in Dunn’s observation about the various types of events that may be hosted at the Center. Indeed, one of the only LEED-certified “green” buildings of its kind in South Dakota, the McCrory Gardens and Center complex could become a focal point for promoting ecotourism development throughout the Great Plains region.

• The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff and Kentucky State University both are Level I 1890 PLGUs that feature evidence of campus visitor centers on their websites. Nevertheless, the information provided about these centers is minimal in one case and invalid in the other. The webpage for the Information and Welcome Center – or Visitor Information Center, as it is referred to interchangeably – at the University of
Arkansas at Pine Bluff lists only an address and office hours with no phone number.\textsuperscript{36} By contrast, the description provided on the Kentucky State University Visitors Center webpage is much more detailed and is more likely to generate interest, particularly among those who are interested in African-American cultural heritage preservation:

> A new development in the planning stages for the Visitor's Center is a state-of-the-art interactive Kiosk containing both a chronological history of the University, education of African Americans in Kentucky, and other documentation of contributions and achievements of Kentucky's African Americans. Additionally, a series of changing historical and cultural exhibits is maintained throughout the year in the Visitor and Information Center.\textsuperscript{37}

Alas, however, this innovative, interpretive approach to campus visitor information provision has yet to come to pass. According to a respondent at the university, the Visitors Center is no longer in existence due to budget cuts, thus making Kentucky State University another likely addition to the “N/A” capacity level along with at least seven other 1890 PLGUs. This points to the programming challenges that some lower capacity PLGUs experience. Regardless of how brilliant, relevant, helpful, or necessary a visitor programming concept may be, without resources to bring it to fruition, it is likely not to happen.

\textit{Knowing what we have: reflections on a Level II 1890 school.}

Fort Valley State University in Fort Valley, GA, is one of four historically black 1890 PLGUs that rank as Level II capacity institutions (Virginia State University, Delaware State University, and Florida A&M University are the others). With the majority of the eighteen 1890 schools comprising Level I and the “N/A” category, the analysis’ findings so far suggest that tourism planning and development capacity, as documented here, is not common among


\textsuperscript{37} Kentucky State University’s visitor center webpage is available at http://www.kysu.edu/about/heritage/ceskaa/visitorscenter.htm, accessed June 1, 2011.
the 1890 PLGUs institutions. Yet, Fort Valley State appears to have two distinctive assets that likely would be the pride of any PLGU.

The Anderson House Museum and Welcome Center is cited as the institution’s oldest building. In addition to serving as “an official reception area for visitors to the university,” the Anderson House is an exhibition space for the Biggs Collection of 19th century antique furnishings that were bequeathed to an African-American slave woman by her owner. According to the Anderson House webpage, the Smithsonian Institution expressed interest in the collection; however, the slave woman’s grandson opted to donate the antiques to Fort Valley State instead. The Anderson House’s vision is “to serve as a viable university and public information center that responds to the education and facility usage needs of small groups by providing a welcoming atmosphere of learning.”

Located on the northern end of campus is the C.W. Pettigrew Farm and Community Life Center (or simply the Pettigrew Center), “a full-service conference, convention, and fine arts facility” described as “an outreach program of Fort Valley State University.” According to the description featured on the Pettigrew Center’s website, the facility exemplifies conference and event service planning as a form of university-community outreach/engagement:

The C.W. Pettigrew Farm and Community Life Center is a full-service, 55,000 square-foot, conference/convention/fine arts facility that provides outreach services to the Fort Valley State University community. The building houses the center’s Administrative Offices and the Fort Valley State University Cooperative Extension Program. The Pettigrew Center facilities are available to individuals, groups and organizations for educational, cultural, business, civic, and public service functions or private parties . . . The center’s professional staff is available to help with the planning, scheduling and implementation of programming for your event.

38 The Anderson House Museum and Welcome Center webpage is available at http://past.fvsu.edu/about/anderson-house, accessed March 16, 2011.
During the course of conducting survey phone interviews in May 2011, two different representatives at Fort Valley State University were reached in an effort to learn more about the Anderson House’s function as a visitor information center, as well as the conference and event services functions within the Pettigrew Center. Because these two entities could not be reached during the survey phone interview process, other offices that were assumed to be capable of addressing general questions about the university were reached instead. Below are the questions that were asked along with the responses.

*Interviewer: Is there only one visitor/welcome center within the university? If not, can you tell me about the other visitor/welcome center(s) in terms of location and departmental affiliation? Does your visitor/welcome center have a relationship with the other center(s)?*

Respondent 1: There is no visitor or welcome center on this campus. (Executive-level office representative, personal communication, May 10, 2011)

*Interviewer: Is there only one conference and event services office within the university? If not, can you tell me about the other conference and event services office(s) in terms of location and departmental affiliation? Does your office have a relationship with the other office(s)?*

Respondent 2: We don’t have a conference office here. Each department coordinates its own events. (Executive-level office representative, personal communication, May 10, 2011)

Needless to say, these responses were not quite expected given the preceding information gathered from institutional websites. To be fair, the specific offices and the individuals who were reached may not have been aware of the Anderson House and/or the Pettigrew Center. Perhaps they have not had a reason or an opportunity to interface with these operations. Perhaps because the Anderson House serves as a “public information center,” it is not on the faculty/staff radar, as it were. As a facility that houses the institution’s cooperative extension unit and that clearly is a public service functionary, perhaps the Pettigrew Center is off the faculty/staff radar as well.
Nevertheless, these two episodes point to a broader issue that is suggested by those who refer to public service as university’s “third mission” (Roper and Hirth 2005). University outreach – and now engagement, perhaps – has an enduring stigma as the least of the three research university missions. University cultures that perpetuate this perception may be doing not only the broader community a disservice, but the institution a disservice as well, particularly with regard to grant-eligible museum spaces and revenue-generating conference and event service operations. Indeed, according to a subsequent in-person conversation with a knowledgeable Fort Valley State alumnus, the Anderson House receives grant support from the Macon Arts Alliance and the Peach County Tourism Committee. When the respondent learned about the previous inquiries, he remarked, “It is about knowing what we have. If we as a university don’t know or don’t show that we value what we have, how can we expect anyone else to?” (Fort Valley State University alumnus, personal communication, May 26, 2011)

**Summary of phase III analysis**

Beyond the potential loss of financial support due to a couple of public relations missteps, the Fort Valley State example illuminates an issue that all communities face when there is an opportunity to tell its story. If a community does not recognize, understand, or simply is ill-informed about the value of its cultural assets, it stands to lose them through neglect, through usurpation or co-optation, or through loss of memory over time. Indeed, there is power in storytelling; power to include and power to exclude. Unrecognized cultural assets can become devalued and get lost, ignored, and eventually omitted from a community’s story. Educational institutions like research universities that have the capacity to recognize and to preserve these assets are powerful community storytellers and, ultimately, placemakers.
Based on the phase III analysis, Level IV and Level III PLGUs in general are advancing themselves as placemakers in their municipalities and regions through well-organized and sometimes vivid marketing efforts that frame their involvement with tourism planning and development as a form of community-engaged public service. Cooperative extension tourism emerged as the most utilized mechanism in this vein, as images and language promoting cooperative extension’s involvement with agritourism, ecotourism, and cultural heritage tourism were found to prevail in that order. Service themes found accompanying these predominant tourism planning and development approaches include economic development, visitor service training, business development, and community collaboration and capacity building. Level IV and III cooperative extension programs were found to deploy these services through sophisticated, collaboratively organized web portals like Clemson University and the University of Illinois’ joint Pee Dee Agritourism Passport and the Ohio State University’s Tourism Toolbox. Such broad-based collaborative efforts suggest strong programming and networking capacity among these institutions. In addition to an apparently keen ability to maximize social capital networks within their communities, they also articulate with other Level IV and Level III cooperative extension programs, as is the case with North Carolina State University Tourism Extension’s training initiatives with Rutgers University and the University of Georgia.

Level II and Level I cooperative extension tourism programs overall were found to focus on agritourism first, cultural heritage tourism second, and ecotourism last. Regardless of the order, agritourism clearly is an emphasis for cooperative extension tourism programs at all levels. Indeed, the USDA has been providing grant funds for agritourism as a value-added rural business development strategy for a number of years, as suggested by a recent $37 million Value Added Producer Grant announcement’s copious listing of grantee case
While Level IV and Level III institutions are competing successfully for other USDA funds available for agritourism training – as evidenced by the various workshops offered by North Carolina State University – Level II and Level I institutions do not appear to be accessing these funding opportunities. Kansas State University’s local agritourism resource list has not been updated in three years as of this writing. The University of Alaska’s cooperative extension tourism program focuses primarily on cultural heritage and nature tourism. West Virginia State University’s program appears to have abandoned an Irish-inspired ecotourism project in favor of an agritourism quilting trail; innovative, indeed, but perhaps too late as some higher capacity institutions that in the early 2000s were thriving now are struggling with lack of funding support.

On the conference and event services front, Level IV and Level III PLGUs appear to promote cultural heritage tourism and nature tourism rather evenly in their communities with ties to local CVBs, chambers of commerce, and state tourism offices. Some of these institutions display a talent for highly descriptive – if not overwrought – place marketing language, like the University Conferences and Catering division at the University of New Hampshire, a Level IV institution. This talent may pay off as potential clients are drawn in by palpable sights, sounds, and hospitality services that seem to go above and beyond the call of duty, particularly for a university-based operation. If clients are not so easily wooed, then at least the institution has documented proof of its efforts to promote local businesses and the overall economic competitiveness and quality of life appeal of the surrounding community.

Conversely, Level II and Level I conference and event services operations, in general, appear to be less invested in their external surroundings and more preoccupied with selling

---

their facilities and services. It is a subtle difference, arguably, but a difference nonetheless. The conference and event outfits at the University of Connecticut and Montana State University seem to fulfill an unspoken engagement promise by marketing themselves as part of their communities; by contrast, Oregon State University’s conference services operation emphasizes the campus and its services. As a consequence, it deemphasizes its potential role as a powerfully engaged placemaker like Iowa State University, a Level IV PLGU that promotes itself and its hometown of Ames as “A Winning Combination.” Touted as one of the largest university-based operations of its kind in the country, Oregon State’s conference planning team may be doing something right; however, the question becomes is it doing it to the detriment of other businesses in the surrounding area, thereby reneging on the institution’s land-grant mission?

Finally, with regard to campus visitor information centers, the differences between high capacity and low capacity PLGUs are rather stark. Though this mechanism was found to be the least permeated with tourism marketing images and messages, campus visitor information centers at Level IV and Level III institutions nevertheless maintain relationships with external tourism entities such as local CVBs, chambers, and state tourism offices. The University of Arizona promotes itself as “a premier destination for visitors to the Southwest,” which suggests a regional tourism development perspective on the institution’s part. The University of Wisconsin features two visitor centers, one for prospective students, another for Madison tourists. As mentioned in the case study chapter, Rutgers University’s Visitor Center has become an official visitor center for the state of New Jersey. By contrast,

42 See the University of Arizona’s Visitor Guide webpage available at http://wc.arizona.edu/ads/visitorguide/, accessed July 3, 2011
Level II and Level I campus visitor centers overall stick to narrow admissions-oriented functions, assuming that their missions are clearly communicated and that their funding is intact.

**Tourism planning and development at private research universities and public non-land-grant research universities**

As established previously, PLGUs are legislatively mandated to provide public service to communities within their states through cooperative extension. While private research universities and public non-land-grant research universities are exempt from the cooperative extension mandate, many of them express a commitment to community and public service in their missions, thus making them comparable to PLGUs. Indeed, the AAU website features a “Campus Community Service Directory” page with links to each of its members’ various administrative units that are dedicated to coordinating and/or providing community engagement services. According to the page, the AAU first compiled this list in 1996.43

Towards achieving a more comprehensive national picture of tourism planning and development activity among U.S. universities, the foregoing analysis was applied to private and public non-land-grant AAU-member institutions. Below is a brief summary of findings.

**Tourism planning and development mechanisms.**

Because private universities and public non-land-grant research universities do not have cooperative extension programs, their tourism planning and development capacity is assessed here by the three other mechanisms: academic tourism programs, conference and event services, and campus visitor information centers. Table 23 provides an overview of the institutions that do and do not feature these mechanisms.

---

As was observed with PLGUs, the most common mechanism among these 38 universities is conference and event services, as 32 (84%) of them feature it. Again, this may be attributed to this mechanism’s revenue generating potential. Campus visitor information centers rank a distant second, as 18 (46%) feature this mechanism. Interestingly, only one of the 39 universities included in this portion of the analysis – the University of Colorado at Boulder (appears in bold red type in Table 23) – was found to have an academic tourism program. As mentioned previously, in some academic circles, tourism and hospitality programs are viewed as vocational and, therefore, less scholarly, which has led to calls for increased sociological perspectives to legitimize the field academically (Aitchison, 2001; Edensor, 2000). As leading research universities, AAU institutional cultures likely perceive tourism programs in this way. Thus, in addition to the fact that cooperative extension tourism cannot be considered a tourism planning and development mechanism for these institutions, this finding also makes it difficult to determine the extent to which there may be levels of tourism planning and development capacity among them.

In lieu of identifying capacity levels, a simple inventory based on the two remaining mechanisms reveals the following:

Institutional type. Overall, the public non-land-grant universities have higher concentrations of campus visitor information centers and conference and event services than their private counterparts. Of the 14 public non-land-grant universities included in this analysis, 9 (64%) feature campus visitor information centers and 13 (93%) feature conference and event services. By contrast, of the 24 private universities, 9 (37%) have campus visitor information centers and 19 (79%) feature conference and event services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23. Campus visitor information centers and conference and event services at private universities and public non-land-grant universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University (Bloomington)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Stony Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan (Ann Arbor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas, Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- †† - Ivy League institution  
- † - "Public Ivy" institution  
- E - named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification  
- CC - member of Campus Compact  

Notes: Public non-land-grant universities appear with gray background; campus locations in parentheses indicate distinctions made by Greene (2001), not the AAU
As members of the AAU, all of these universities may be considered prestigious. To achieve further distinctions among them with regard to perceived prestige, one may observe that of the 14 institutions that feature both mechanisms (in bold type), 10 (70%) carry “Ivy” distinctions, i.e., two are bona fide members of the Ivy League (Harvard and Yale) and eight are considered “Public Ivies.” This further suggests association between perceived institutional prestige and university tourism planning and development capacity.

Community engagement. As mentioned above, the AAU has produced an annual directory of its members’ community engagement resources for the past 16 years. According to the current directory, each member has resources (i.e., administrative office, web portal, materials) dedicated to community service. This general commitment to community engagement is reflected further by the fact that nearly 90% of AAU-member institutions also are dues-paying members of Campus Compact. Three of the public non-land-grant AAU members – Indiana University, SUNY-Stony Brook, and University of Kansas – and one private AAU member – University of Southern California – are designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, though this distinction does little more than emphasize these institutions’ interest in having their commitment recognized. Perhaps a more appropriate question would be which AAU-member institutions do not appear to be committed to community engagement?

Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements.

Like their PLGU counterparts, some of the private and public non-land-grant universities included in this inquiry also exhibit programming and networking capacity enhancement characteristics through memberships with CIVSA, ACCED-I, and Unique Venues (denoted as UNIQUE in Table 24). Though non-land-grant universities did participate
in the 2011 National Extension Tourism Conference, none of these universities were found to be among them.

Table 24 displays the results of a tourism planning and development capacity enhancement inventory of these private and public non-land-grant universities. With institutions from the previous mechanism inventory still appearing in bold, the additional capacity enhancement layer begins to clarify which institutions may have greater tourism planning and development capacity overall.

Three universities emerge as potentially having the greatest tourism planning and development capacity among non-land-grant AAU institutions. Of all of the institutions, the University of Colorado at Boulder is the only one that indicates positive for all mechanisms and capacity enhancements. Two private AAU-member universities – the University of Southern California and Yale University – rank second to Colorado because neither one has an academic tourism program.

Emory University is the only other institution that indicates positive for all capacity enhancements. There is a possible discrepancy here, however, as a respondent from Emory confirmed that the university does not have a campus visitor information center. Without a campus visitor information center, it is unclear which unit within the institution maintains an active membership with CIVSA. CIVSA representatives could not be reached to clarify which unit within the university is a member. It is possible that the university’s admissions office is a member of CIVSA. If this is the case, then the institution’s potential for tourism planning and development capacity is questionable in that area. As mentioned previously, there is ongoing debate within the campus visitor information profession regarding whether or not campus visitor centers should serve solely as a student admissions mechanism or more broadly as a campus and community visitor mechanism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>CIVSA</th>
<th>ACCED-I</th>
<th>UNIQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>♣♣</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>♣♣</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>♣♣</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>♣♣</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Chicago</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>♣♣</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>E, CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>♣♣</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>♣    (Bloomington) E, CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Stony Brook</td>
<td>E, CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Buffalo</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>♣ CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>♣ CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>E, CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>♣ CC  (Ann Arbor)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill</td>
<td>♣ CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas, Austin</td>
<td>♣ CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>♣</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>♣ CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIVSA – Collegiate Information and Visitor Services Association; ACCED-I – Association of Collegiate Conference and Event Directors International; UNIQUE – Unique Venues
Hotel, museum and golf facilities

As was done for PLGU institutions, the capacity inventory was expanded to consider the presence of hotels, museums, and golf courses at private and public non-land-grant universities. Table 25 provides descriptive statistics from this analysis. PLGU data are included in this table for comparison purposes only.

As with PLGUs, museums were found to be the most common of the three facilities, as 89% of these institutions feature them. As cultural assets that can help to promulgate the educational mission of universities, this is no surprise. Private universities among the AAU outnumber their public non-land-grant counterparts with regard to this feature as well as hotels. Overall, among this group, hotels and golf courses were found to be much less common than museums, with 25% and 20% of the institutions featuring them, respectively.

| Table 25. Private and public non-land-grant university hotels, museums, and golf courses |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Private AAU, n=24                            | Hotel | %Level | %TOTAL | Museum | %Level | %TOTAL | Golf course | %Level | %TOTAL |
|                                               | Hotel | %Level | %TOTAL | Museum | %Level | %TOTAL | Golf course | %Level | %TOTAL |
| Private AAU, n=24                            | 6     | 25%    | 63%    | 20     | 83%    | 59%    | 5           | 20%    | 55%    |
| Public non-land grant AAU, n=14              | 5     | 28%    | 37%    | 14     | 100%   | 41%    | 4           | 28%    | 45%    |
| TOTAL                                         | 11    | 34%    | 9      |         |        |        |             |        |        |
| % of total private and non-land grant AAU univ, N=38 | 28%    |        | 89%    |        |        |        |             |        | 23%    |
| % of total PLGUs                              | 32%    |        | 88%    |        |        |        |             |        | 52%    |
These institutions feature hotels at about the same rate as PLGUs; however, PLGUs actually outpace their private and public non-land-grant counterparts with regard to percentage featuring golf course facilities. This latter finding is quite interesting and perhaps even unexpected. As detailed previously, golf courses and their country clubs generally are perceived as private enclaves intended primarily for social recreation and business networking among social elites. Herein, one might expect prestigious Ivies like Yale – which reportedly has one of the oldest collegiate golf courses in the U.S. – and Harvard – which does not have a golf course at all, at least not in the traditional sense (see below) – to dominate the list of institutions with such facilities. Yet, this is not the case. Indeed, there is almost an even split between private AAU members and public non-land-grant members that feature golf course facilities. This is one area where the perceived prestige association may be questionable with regard to tourism planning and development capacity.

**Who says it is tourism and engagement for non-land-grant universities too?**

Some of the preceding observations suggest that the private and public non-land-grant universities included in this analysis are less likely to connect their campus visitor information centers and conference and event services departments to tourism and are much less likely to frame them as forms of community engagement. Despite this, there are examples of place marketing strategy usage among these institutions that employ tourism development and/or community engagement language and concepts. Based on visual surveys of campus visitor information center and conference and event services websites, below are some highlights:

- Stanford University in Palo Alto, CA, features a “Tourists and First-time Visitors” webpage that lists a variety of cultural heritage (e.g., buildings, museums), sports, and nature-based attractions. Interestingly, the Stanford University Golf Course, which
was designed in 1930 and apparently “is consistently rated one of the finest courses in the world,” is not included on the tourist webpage, likely due to the fact that the course is open only to “current faculty, staff, students, members, alumni and their guests.”

- While Harvard University does not have a golf course in the traditional sense, in June 2010, the university opened the Allston Field and Fairway, a “fun, family-friendly neighborhood recreation for the summer and fall” located in a former garage owned by the institution in the surrounding Allston neighborhood. According to an item in the Harvard Gazette:

  The site was host to a temporary ice skating rink last winter. The new use is part of Harvard’s ongoing commitment to strengthen the active stewardship of its properties and improve community vitality in Allston.

  “Given the success of the ice rink, we wanted to host another community-friendly attraction, as we continue our search for a long-term tenant for this property,” said Katie Lapp, Harvard’s executive vice president. “The Field and Fairway is yet another example of how Harvard is constantly looking for ways to benefit its communities.” (2010)

- Like Stanford, both Columbia University in New York and Emory University in Atlanta invoke tourism-related language in web-based visitor information materials. Though it does not have a campus visitor information center, Emory publishes an annual “Visitor’s Guide” that promotes a plethora of campus- and community-based visitor attractions, as well as details the university’s commitment to environmental sustainability and community service. Emory University’s “Tourists and First-time Visitors” webpage is an example of a much more utilitarian approach, as the site provides a brief overview of campus visitor policies inviting tourists “to explore any of the

---


outdoor green space on campus” as all buildings – save Low Memorial Library where the Visitors Center is said to be located on the second floor – require university I.D. for entry. As a vestige of a reputedly hospitable South, and Columbia, as a symbol of a Northeastern hurried brilliance and austerity, both may be potential case studies about how university visitor information marketing and delivery styles reinforce or challenge destination images that may derive from visitor perceptions of regional societies and cultures.

- The University of Washington in Seattle and the University of Colorado at Boulder both are examples of public non-land-grant universities that feature visitor resource websites replete with place promotion language and images. The University of Washington offers a fairly comprehensive, portal-like visitor webpage with an interactive “Visitors Center Locator Map” and links to nine different campus-based “Museums and Exhibits,” as well as links to community resources including the City of Seattle, Seattle Tourism, and the state of Washington’s travel website.

Somewhat similar to the University of New Hampshire conference services example cited in the PLGU analysis III section, the University of Colorado at Boulder’s visitor webpage provides a palpable description of the surrounding area that reads as if it appears in a travel marketing brochure:

Visitors will be delighted to discover that Boulder and the surrounding area offers activities for every interest. Photographers, music lovers, rock climbers, Olympians, artists, and others flock to this great city because of its scenic beauty, vibrant culture, and fabulous amenities. Boulder is just three hours from 11 ski resorts, 40 minutes from Denver, and just moments from 43,000 acres of open space and trails. But with about 90,000 residents, there’s plenty to do inside the city limits. On sunny afternoons, the Pearl Street Mall in

---

46 Columbia University “Tourists and First-time Visitors” webpage is available at http://www.columbia.edu/content/tourists-first-time-visitors-0.html, accessed July 1, 2011.

47 The University of Washington’s visitor webpage is available at http://www.washington.edu/discover/visit/, accessed July 1, 2011.
downtown Boulder bustles with street performers and shoppers, while the Boulder Campus teems with students playing Frisbee and relaxing in the shade. We invite you to explore this great community. 48

Unlike the University of New Hampshire’s conference services division, this passage is not selling a service; rather, it appears to be performing a public service by “invit[ing]” a diverse cross-section of visitors to take advantage of the various assets that the surrounding community has to offer. This perhaps is an example of how a university helps to advance its community’s destination image in a manner that does not appear to benefit the institution directly (e.g., conference service and tour fees).

With links to over two dozen local and regional tourism and recreation entities, the University of Colorado at Boulder may best exemplify a balanced approach to university-community place promotion deriving from an institution’s enlightened self-interest.

• While SUNY Stony Brook has never had an on-campus hotel facility, there are plans to build one there through a land lease agreement with Hilton Hotels that will generate at least $100,000 annually for the university. A 2009 university press release suggests that the institution once anticipated getting some public relations mileage out of the deal as well, as the development is promoted as a benefit to both the university and its diverse stakeholders in the surrounding community and beyond:

Stony Brook University hosts more than 500,000 guests and visitors every year, to such events and activities as the Stony Brook Film Festival, Parents & Family Weekend, Homecoming Weekend/Wolf Stock, commencement and convocation ceremonies, conferences, symposiums and dignitary visits and major athletic events such as the upcoming 2011 NCAA Women’s’ Final Four Lacrosse Championships. In addition, tens of thousands of patients treated at Stony Brook University Medical Center with family and friends visiting from eastern Long Island and others coming from long distances will find the on-

48 The University of Colorado at Boulder’s “Planning Your Visit” webpage is available at http://www.colorado.edu/visit/planning/index.html, accessed July 1, 2011.
 Despite this strategic effort to use event and medical tourism to generate community appeal around the project, some students, faculty, and local environmentalists have accessed legal channels to stop the hotel’s construction because it would “raze part of a green belt and harm a local salamander habitat.” Though the dispute has not yet been resolved, the university and its development partners are working to open the hotel for business by fall 2012 (Mallia and Du, 2011).

Summary of non-land-grant university tourism planning and development

This brief analysis suggests that, overall, PLGUs appear to have greater tourism planning and development capacity than their private and public non-land-grant university counterparts. Even when cooperative extension tourism is not taken into account, PLGUs clearly outpace the other universities with regard to featuring campus visitor information centers (62% PLGU vs. 46% non-land-grant universities) and golf courses (52% vs. 23%) and slightly outpace them with regard to featuring hotel facilities (32% vs. 28%) Non-land-grant universities do have a slight edge over PLGUs with regard to conference and event services, as 85% of them feature this mechanism vs. 74% of PLGUs. However, only one of the non-land-grant universities features a formal academic tourism program, which suggests that the other 37 are less likely to engage in tourism education and research activity. Both PLGUs and their private and public non-land-grant university counterparts feature museums at about the same rate (88% vs. 89%).

These findings should not deter further research on private and public non-land-grant university tourism planning and development activity. Among these institutions, there are efforts to promote campus-based attractions to tourists. There also is evidence of community
projects and boosterism efforts that inculcate destination development concepts. Indeed, the predominance of conference and event services at private institutions and the roles of visitors in sustaining them could make for an interesting study, as well as further inquiry regarding the unexpected predominance of golf courses at PLGUs: public service or private advancement?
Chapter IV.

Case Studies: Rutgers University with the Gateway Tourism Region and Alcorn State University with the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area

This chapter explores two regional PLGU tourism planning and development case studies. The first features Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a Level III PLGU with a flagship campus in New Brunswick/Piscataway, NJ, and a smaller urban campus in Newark, NJ, both of which are located in the Gateway Tourism Region. The second case study involves Alcorn State University, a Level I PLGU that is a legislatively designated partner with the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area. As stated in the introductory chapter to this study, this chapter aims to address the study’s third research question and guiding hypothesis as stated below:

Research question 3: What are reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development? Do benefits and drawbacks differ based on institutional capacity levels?

Guiding hypothesis: Reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development are rooted in concepts of placemaking which include community collaboration or community power conflict; enhanced or inhibited place competitiveness; and positive or negative destination image formation. Because higher capacity level PLGUs are more involved in placemaking efforts in their communities, they are more likely to experience reciprocal benefits and drawbacks than PLGUs at lower capacity levels.
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey distinguishes itself from other institutions
– and even itself from within itself – in various ways that, depending on one’s view,
simultaneously fosters a culture of pride and divisiveness. The university’s heritage, indeed, is
undeniably rich and is promoted as a source of prestige and uniqueness as expressed in this
identity summary:

The Only 1: Rutgers is the sole university in the United States that is a colonial
college, a land-grant institution, and a public university. The university draws on a
storied legacy of innovation and strong ties to a complex and diverse state to serve the
public through education, research and community engagement.49

49 See Rutgers University’s “Who We Are” webpage, available at http://www.rutgers.edu/about-rutgers/who-we-
are, accessed April 14, 2011.
A brief history of Rutgers: seeds of collaboration, conflict, and competitiveness.

Established in 1766, Rutgers is the eighth oldest university in the United States and is among nine original Colonial Colleges, seven of which are members of the Ivy League (the College of William and Mary in Virginia is the only other public institution in this group). Originally named Queens College, the institution was renamed Rutgers College in 1825 after Colonel Henry Rutgers – a Revolutionary War veteran, a Columbia College (now Columbia University) graduate, and one of the wealthiest landowners in Manhattan at the time – donated a $5,000 bond to keep the institution from closing for a third time after two closings between 1795 and 1825. Colonel Rutgers also donated a bell to the struggling school, which is housed in the cupola above Old Queen’s, the oldest building on the original New Brunswick campus and a U.S. National Historic Landmark cited as “one of the finest examples of Federal architecture in the United States.”

A spirit of persistence and competitiveness permeates the institution’s telling of its “storied” history, particularly with regard to how it views itself in comparison to its nearby Colonial College peer, Princeton University. During its late-18th and early-19th century financial struggles, Rutgers nearly was merged with Princeton; the measure is said to have failed by one vote. Rutgers is cast as having “prevailed over Princeton” in 1864 to become New Jersey’s land-grant college, a pivotal “event that led to Rutgers’ emergence as a modern institution of higher learning.” 50 Five years later, Rutgers and Princeton participated in the first documented game of intercollegiate football. Rutgers won the game, thus becoming known as “The Birthplace of College Football.” 51

With the advent of the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station in 1880 and subsequent expansion of graduate studies programs in other practical sciences including pharmaceuticals and engineering, by the mid-1920s, Rutgers College had become Rutgers University. As a burgeoning example of a hybridized liberal arts teaching, European research, and American land-grant institution, by this time, the University appears to have transcended its past struggles steadily and strategically. Perhaps taking advantage of a national Progressive Era ethos, it allowed educational access to females by establishing the New Jersey College for Women in 1918 (which later became the all-female Douglass College). A year later, Rutgers graduated one of its “most famous and accomplished alumni,” Paul Robeson, who is distinguished not only athletically as the institution’s first African-American football player but also intellectually as a Phi Beta Kappa inductee and class valedictorian. The University created opportunities for so-called “adult learners” with the establishment of University College in 1934 and by admitting qualified World War II veterans under the GI Bill in the 1940s.

With a track record as an “institution for all people,” Rutgers was designated officially as New Jersey’s state university by legislative acts in 1945 and 1956. It entered a phase of expansion, epitomizing Benson and Harkavy’s (2000) “Entrepreneurial University” model through the establishment of two regional campuses: to the north, The University of Newark in 1946 and, in 1950, the College of South Jersey in Camden. The institution’s telling of its continued expansion during this latter half of the 20th century squares with Benson and Harkavy’s characterization of the “Entrepreneurial University” as intensely focused on the advancement of research and on producing graduate-level scholars and professional experts:

Graduate education in the arts and sciences grew through the establishment of the Graduate School–New Brunswick, the Graduate School–Newark, and the Graduate School–Camden. Professional schools were formed to serve students in the fields of business; communication, information, and library studies; criminal justice; education; fine arts; law; management and labor relations; nursing; planning and public policy; psychology; public affairs and administration; and social work. Meanwhile, as industry and government sought partners in solving problems and advancing knowledge, the concept of the research university emerged. With increased support from state, federal, and corporate partners, Rutgers’ strength in research grew dramatically. In 1989, in recognition of its enhanced stature, Rutgers was invited to join the prestigious Association of American Universities, an organization comprising the top 61 research universities in North America.\textsuperscript{54}

Though it took nearly a century, Rutgers thus joined the fold of its nearby Colonial College football rival that helped to found the AAU in 1900 with six other Ivy League universities, four other private universities, and three public universities (Speicher, 2000). To assert that Rutgers suffers from a history of Ivy envy may be speculative; however, when Greene (2001) named Rutgers-New Brunswick to his list of “Public Ivies,” it did not take long for New Brunswick’s Office of Undergraduate Admissions to incorporate the designation in its marketing efforts as yet another way to distinguish itself not only from other competing public universities, but also from its regional Newark and Camden campuses. As mentioned previously, the Rutgers-New Brunswick “Public Ivy” marketing campaign prompted the provost in Newark to propose “promot[ing] and market[ing] the campus separately” from New Brunswick.\textsuperscript{55} Such a proposal is anathema to the flagship metaphor, of course; as the original historic campus where the university’s authentic history and heritage hive—depending on one’s perspective—the New Brunswick campus also serves as the administrative command and control center for the entire institution.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
Interestingly, the AAU does not distinguish Rutgers’ flagship campus from the regional ones as it does for some other PLGU members like University of Missouri-Columbia, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and certain University of California campuses (e.g., Berkeley, Irvine, and Santa Barbara). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, however, indicates clear distinctions among Rutgers’ three campuses with regard to graduate-level education. Indeed, if Ph.D. graduate output is an indicator of institutional prestige, then Rutgers-New Brunswick is recognized as the most prestigious of the three university campuses. With nearly 38,000 undergraduate and graduate students and five campuses spread across over 2,600 acres, the New Brunswick campus is categorized by Carnegie as a “Research University with very high research activity.” By contrast, Rutgers-Newark is situated on 38 acres with an undergraduate and graduate student population of about 11,500 (primarily commuters) is categorized by Carnegie as a “Research University with high research activity.” With about 5,700 undergraduate and graduate students on 31 acres, the Camden campus is categorized by Carnegie as a “Master’s University with medium programs.” It likely is no coincidence that every U.S.-based member of the AAU is categorized as a Carnegie Research University with very high research activity like Rutgers-New Brunswick.

A pecking order among Rutgers’ three campuses also appears to emerge with regard to the community engagement-oriented marketing of its tourism planning and development mechanisms, as well as with regard to the marketing of surrounding communities. According to the university’s “Attractions & Destinations” webpage, its three campuses feature “a wealth of enlightening and engaging attractions and destinations for visitors of all ages.” The tagline

---

Figure 20. A collection of New Jersey tourism maps, passages, and images promoting the state’s six tourism regions (top left) and the Gateway Region (center) where Newark (passage 1, top right) and New Brunswick (passage 2, lower left) are located. Rutgers-New Brunswick, noted prominently in passage 2, is said to be the number one tourist attraction in Middlesex County. Rutgers-Camden is located in the Delaware River Region. Sources: 2011 New Jersey African American Visitors Guide (statewide regional map); 2011 New Jersey Visitors Guide (Gateway Region map and passages)

“Three Great Destinations Only at Rutgers” suggests the university’s attempt to provide a balanced representation of campus-based assets that may be of interest to visitors; yet, the flagship New Brunswick campus – likely due to its history, size, and vast facilities (Newark and Camden have 33 and 37 buildings, respectively, while New Brunswick has nearly 650) – is cited as having twice as many attractions as the Newark campus and nearly three times as
many as Camden. Even when the Camden and Newark lists are combined (19 total), New Brunswick’s list of attractions still outnumbers them (23 total). Considering that the geographic scope of this case study does not actually include Camden, however, one may surmise that Rutgers-New Brunswick and Rutgers-Newark stand to enhance the place competitiveness of the entire Gateway Region (see Figure 20) – a tourist region where they both are located. The manner in which these places are marketed internally and externally, however, suggests that both campuses contribute to destination image, albeit in different ways.

**Constructing competitive institutional place image in the Gateway Region.**

As a Level III capacity PLGU, Rutgers is teeming with tourism planning and development capacity assets, though the majority of the assets appear to be on the New Brunswick campus. Understanding the extent to which these tourism planning and development mechanisms and capacity enhancements are advanced as part of an overarching university-community engagement ethos helps to illuminate further the different levels of tourism planning and development capacity between the New Brunswick and Newark campuses. Arguably, these differences are reflective of their surrounding communities, which suggests that each campus wields some level of placemaking power.

While Newark and New Brunswick both are urban centers within the Gateway Region – so named “from its history as the ‘Gateway to Freedom’ for millions of immigrants” (New Jersey Department of State Division of Travel & Tourism, n.d.) – the treatment of each is slightly different, as illustrated in Figure 20. With a population of approximately 277,000, Newark is the state’s largest city. The New Jersey Division of Travel and Tourism’s description of Newark, or rather its attractions, is decidedly site-oriented. Readers are informed about three specific venues – the Newark Museum, the Prudential Center sports
arena, and the New Jersey Performing Arts Center (NJPAC) – within an emergent downtown tourist bubble. The Ironbound District with its Iberian and Brazilian restaurants is mentioned; however, the University Heights District – which borders NJPAC and the Newark Museum and includes Rutgers-Newark and three other higher education institutions – is not referenced here.

Conversely, with a little over 55,000 residents, New Brunswick is depicted in favorable place-based terms as “a shining star in New Jersey’s urban center circuit.” New Brunswick’s Theater Row complex is promoted as helping to make the city “an arts and cultural powerhouse.” Indeed, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, located “[w]ithin a few blocks” of the city’s “bustling downtown area,” likely is considered a factor in the “powerhouse” designation. In the college towns section of the 2010 New Jersey Travel Guide, Rutgers-New Brunswick and Princeton once again are compared, this time as tourist destinations and community placemakers, with Rutgers-Newark and Rutgers-Camden receiving minimal references:

University towns around the state offer visitors an appealing array of on- and off-campus attractions for students, visitors, and families.

If you are looking for a mix of history, fine and eclectic dining, ivy-covered walls and a vibrant art scene, Princeton is your kind of place. . . .

New Brunswick is the birthplace of Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey. Home to the university’s largest campus comprised of five smaller campuses, its settings include bucolic farms, sprawling suburban landscapes and a vibrant college town. Rutgers also maintains campuses in Newark and Camden. (p. 24; see Figure 21)

The New Brunswick campus’ powerful image as the “The State University of New Jersey” is reflected in local tourism materials as well. Though a resident university expert comments that the city destroyed much of its valuable heritage through 1970s urban renewal projects
(Rutgers-New Brunswick faculty member, personal communication, January 23, 2011), the Central New Jersey CVB provides a downloadable New Brunswick Historic Downtown Walking Tour brochure that seems to attempt to promote a connected sense of place between downtown and Rutgers’ historic campus which are divided physically by the Northeast Corridor train track. Of the 37 points of interest listed, about a third are Rutgers sites including Voorhees Hall which houses the Zimmerli Art Museum; Schanck Observatory; Kirkpatrick Chapel; and the Old Queens Administration Building along with adjacent Winants Hall, Van Nest Hall, and Geology Hall which houses the university’s Geology Museum (see Figure 22).
The New Brunswick campus appears to wield dominance in at least one other local area within the Gateway Region. The Meadowlands Liberty Region CVB – which promotes sports, retail, entertainment, and nature-based attractions clustered around Newark, Jersey City, Secaucus, NJ – provides a list of area “Schools, Colleges, and Universities” and their phone numbers in its 2011 Official Visitors Guide. Since the organization promotes Newark, one would assume that the list would include Rutgers-Newark; however, where it lists Rutgers University, the phone number to the information center in New Brunswick, RU Info, is provided rather than the phone number to the Campus Information Center that has been in existence at Rutgers-Newark for over a decade (Meadowlands Liberty Convention & Visitors Bureau, 2011, p. 53).
So far, the evidence provided here suggests that despite New Brunswick’s smaller size, it has a more competitive place image than Newark’s which likely is attributed to the heritage and august presence of Rutgers’ flagship campus. Though Rutgers-New Brunswick does not quite match Princeton in terms of resources and academic prestige, according to one statewide policy leadership education professional, New Brunswick has emerged as a competitive entertainment destination due to Rutgers’ collaborative involvement with local community economic development entities.

In New Brunswick, Rutgers, New Brunswick Tomorrow, and the New Brunswick Development Corporation have created a downtown and a place that people want to go. The restaurants are renowned throughout the state, and the theatre and other opportunities. I know folks who would rather go down to downtown NB than downtown Princeton for the restaurants or for the arts. (Personal communication, November 18, 2010)

With regard to Rutgers in Newark, according to the same respondent, there is potential for the city to become more competitive as a place through collaboration with Rutgers; yet, it is not quite clear that the potential is being tapped, at least when it is compared to New Brunswick.

Here in Newark, the chancellor and others have recognized that Rutgers-Newark and Newark can become a college town. So the building of dorms, putting students downtown in Newark is critically important. Having the Business School right in front of Washington Park area is critically important. . . . They need to do more of that. We have three and four story buildings that are vacant. We should be renovating those buildings, putting classes downtown and putting in housing. New Brunswick has done that, and they continue to do that. In New Brunswick, they have the development corporation. You do have an economic development corporation in Newark, but it really needs to be enhanced in its abilities and in its resources. The universities can help in that effort. (Personal communication, November 18, 2010)

Rutgers-Newark is advantageously situated on the cusp between two community areas within the city: (1) the Newark Downtown/Arts district, which has become the nexus of Newark’s revitalization efforts and (2) the University Heights district, which is anchored by three other higher education institutions (i.e., New Jersey Institute of Technology, Essex County College,
and University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey), as well as science, technology, and cultural research centers and several public and private schools.(see Figure 23).

In his November 2010 Address to the Campus, Rutgers-Newark Chancellor Steven Diner confirmed the previous respondent’s observations regarding Rutgers’ role in revitalizing the city, as well as the city’s role in enhancing Rutgers-Newark’s image:

There are many exciting real estate development projects in Newark. The New Jersey Performing Arts Center (NJPAC) will be erecting the tallest building in Newark. It will be located directly across the street from NJPAC and will provide market-rate housing and affordable housing for artists. A new project on Broad Street will provide housing for teachers. Also, the building adjacent to the Rutgers Business School will be renovated to support housing for actors. With financial assistance from The Profeta Urban Investment Foundation, a foundation created by philanthropist and real estate executive Paul Profeta, and business advice and coaching from MBA students from CUEED [Center for Urban Entrepreneurship & Economic Development], a new eatery

Figure 23. Map of Rutgers-Newark’s location straddling the border between University Heights and the Downtown/Arts District in Newark. Map courtesy of Rutgers-Newark Office of Communications.
called Cravings has opened on Halsey Street. The Profeta Urban Investment Foundation and CUEED’s commitment to Halsey Street's continued commercial development is a win-win for both Rutgers-Newark and the city of Newark. Halsey Street’s resurgence promotes entrepreneurship, creates jobs, fuels the local economy, and makes the Rutgers-Newark campus all the more attractive to prospective students and faculty.  

Despite Rutgers-Newark’s location and the redevelopment efforts taking place around it, the respondent’s reference to “universities” in the final statement perhaps signals that Rutgers-Newark may not wield sufficient placemaking power to reimage New Jersey’s largest city, at least not as a singular anchor institution. The crime activity and gang violence that have escalated in Newark since late-2010 certainly makes a reimagining process more challenging (Fahim, 2010); however, according to two leaders in the city – one in public policy education, the other in mass communications – Newark’s image challenges are much more rooted in unresolved power conflicts surrounding issues of race, economic opportunity, residential tenure, and insider-outsider dynamics.

Respondent 1: You have a city that has mired itself in four decades of self-pity, of perpetuating race division, of municipal administrations who have exploited that history and exploited that racial tension to create a city of subsidy. The ethos of Newark, in many ways – particularly among your senior population – is that the rest of the world, state, county owes us; and we’ve had two mayors of long tenure in succession who have said, “It’s not your fault. It’s someone else’s fault, and they should subsidize you.” You cannot look to the residents of Newark for a vision of the future cause they are rooted in that past. They are rooted, too many of them, in that resentment; rooted in their parochialism. Their leadership is rooted in, “What’s in it for me?” . . . I’m not saying these people don’t belong at the table. They need to be invited to participate. But if they were going to have the vision, it would have happened a long time ago. The vision is not in Newark, unfortunately. The next generation who sees what’s happening – high school students, college students, the emerging generation – they need to be at the table. (Public policy leadership administrator, personal communication, Mar 3, 2011)

Respondent 2: Newark tends to be very parochial and they don’t receive outsiders well. They feel that, “If I stayed here through the riots, and you left, you don’t deserve

---

58 The respondent is referring to Kenneth Gibson who served as mayor of Newark for 16 years (1970 to 1986) and his successor, Sharpe James, who served for 20 years (1986 to 2006).
to come back and succeed.” Or, “If you’re an outsider and you don’t know the history, you need to rely on me because I’ve been here. Don’t negate my voice.” And I think that people feel they’re voices are not being heard who’ve been here for the long haul. Therefore, that creates some stress but what’s happening is, on a national level, Newark is really looked at in a very positive light. That in large part is due to the fact that there is this mayor who is now in his second term that is young and bright and well-educated who people can relate to outside the confines of the borders of the city of Newark, New Jersey. As a result, there are a lot of resources that do come into the community which benefits all. And sometimes it doesn’t trickle down in terms of information to others. There’s this tunnel where there’s a gap in information. (Media director, personal communication, Sept 2, 2011)

The respondents’ comments illuminate several areas where university resources – faculty, staff, students, and facilities – could be utilized to create “safe spaces” and opportunities for facilitated conversations about endemic community issues that are difficult to discuss and resolve. However, even though both respondents observe a “parochial” culture among Newark residents, the tones of their comments diverge with regard to how to manage community conversations for planning. The first respondent expresses a lack of confidence in long-time Newark residents to move beyond the past and to engage in community visioning. Conversely, the second respondent seems to think that with improved information delivery, residents may feel more empowered to engage.

With high profile sporting, concert, and cultural events continuing to take place at the Prudential Center and at NJPAC, institutions like Rutgers could play a role in hosting and facilitating community information events that could prepare more residents for business opportunities related to event tourism, as well as gathering their input regarding concerns and ideas regarding the community’s willingness and readiness to receive visitors (Moscardo, 2008). Of course, Rutgers-Newark would need to collaborate with other community stakeholders for such a program. Based on previously quoted respondents, in a large “city of subsidy” with information gaps among numerous community stakeholders, it may be more

\footnote{The respondent is referring to Cory Booker who succeeded Sharpe James as Newark’s mayor in 2006.}
challenging for Rutgers to collaborate in Newark than in New Brunswick where the institution has a stronger geographic presence.

**Behind the image: Tourism planning and development as community engagement**

The bright light – or long shadow, depending on one’s perspective – that Rutgers-New Brunswick casts as a powerful placemaking entity in the Gateway Region has broad place image implications that are not necessarily always positive for the university or the community. In recent years, officials on the New Brunswick campus have been inviting colleagues to think of more ways that the institution can break down barriers between town and gown. For example, Rutgers President Richard McCormick held a series of internal meetings in 2010 to discuss ways to improve collaboration between the university and the New Brunswick community. With participants representing over 50 community-involved faculty and staff, the April 2010 meeting yielded the following insights with “programming” (i.e., events, festivals) like Rutgers Day perceived as a key community engagement tool:

- Rutgers has surprisingly little presence in the downtown community. Expanding continuing education, offering seminars for community members, developing more programming for citizens in general, and holding them downtown at the Heldrich or Hyatt Hotel, would start breaking down the apparent wall to communication. Staff members who already live in the city should be encouraged to become more involved. Right now in the community, the feeling prevails that Rutgers is not accessible and not visible. (S.S., no position title)

- [Rutgers should] hold a festival or other activities to attract [its] students to George Street businesses in the downtown area. (B.H., faculty member)

- New Brunswick feels used as a research object without benefits in return. Rutgers should see its research subjects as partners and build local capacity to do their own research. (D.P., faculty member)

- Rutgers should solicit more input from the community to determine what the city’s assets are, as well as its needs, and build on these assets. (M.W., faculty member)

- Our goals should be to teach faculty how to conduct participatory research, develop grassroots leadership, offer incentives to live in New Brunswick, promote economic
vitality by encouraging students/faculty/staff to be less fearful of the city and to spend their money in town. (B.H., faculty member)

To many in the community, particularly within the Latino population, Rutgers is seen as “the government,” the authority not to trust. This perception – in addition to the language barrier – is at the root of communication problems between the university and New Brunswick residents. The university should make sure that offers of additional help will be welcomed by the intended recipients and not seen as an additional burden. (I.N., academic affairs)

Rutgers Day could be used as outreach to New Brunswick, but not many New Brunswick residents attend the event. Rutgers Day fliers were translated into Spanish and are ready for distribution to the local population. This year, efforts are being made to make Rutgers Day more accessible to residents; such as more programming on Old Queen’s campus or inviting groups from the local communities (police, non-profit, cultural organizations) to a “Community Zone” located on College Avenue Campus. Moreover, members of minority groups are invited by Rutgers religious or cultural centers directly. (D.G., faculty member)

There is a disconnect between the university and the community because people in general do not understand how a huge organization like Rutgers works. Better organization within the university would help, as well as the creation of a clearinghouse. The clearinghouse must be a 2-way process - easy for the community and for Rutgers to use. (E.G., student life; Schnee, et al, 2010)

Some of these comments contrast sharply with the statewide leader’s statement in the previous section that depicts New Brunswick as a better place to visit than Princeton (see p. 214). With the institution being reportedly perceived by residents as “not accessible,” “not visible,” and as an “authority not to trust” but rather “an unknown entity” to “fear,” university representatives who attended the meeting seem to perceive that locals carry a sense of resentment towards the institution. The strategies to help create positive town-gown interactions – a downtown festival and a Rutgers Day event – are not intended for tourists, per se; nonetheless, festivals and events are destination development strategies that can shape perceptions of New Brunswick for both residents and visitors (Getz, 2008; Gunn, 2002). Perhaps welcoming and treating residents as well as one would welcome and treat visitors is one of the keys to successful community engagement, which makes tourism planning and
development all the more relevant. As one Rutgers-New Brunswick respondent interviewed for this study observed: “I don’t think we should view them as any different. . . . everyone who walks through that door is a visitor of the university, and I think everyone should be treated with same customer service: How can we help you? What can we tell you about Rutgers? How can we help you in the surrounding area?” (Campus and visitor information staff member, personal communication, Jan 31, 2011).

A Rutgers-New Brunswick faculty member interviewed for this study suggests that by partnering with the City of New Brunswick to guide, interpret, and possibly expand the Historic Downtown Walking Tour, the university could use its teaching and research expertise to help deconstruct town-gown barriers:

What I think Rutgers could do in this regard is sort of educational and critical thinking education. So, to educate, we give a tour of New Brunswick and people find out more. But the critical thinking education might be to provide layered views of history which I think would really be valuable to elevate people’s cognitive skills about life in general. . . . We could look at ethnic communities over time in New Brunswick. . . . I think we had the only Hungarian Daily in the United States for awhile here. I don’t even know if that’s still in existence. There’s a huge Latino influence now in certain parts. . . . Not only multiple demographic ways of looking and multiple physical ways of looking but also multiple ethnic, racial, and religious views of what’s happened in New Brunswick. . . . there are stories that could be told and, there are opportunities for different groups to create a layer. Not the layer, of course, because that would be a problem. Not to try to get the “one true” history, but rather multiple perspectives. You could see someone funding that and letting different people help with creating the different layers. The richness is in the multiple layers that you could provide through tours and tourism. (Personal communication, Nov 12, 2010)

The concept of dissonant heritage has particular relevance to the respondent’s call for “multiple layers” in interpreting New Brunswick’s historic sites and raises some interesting questions about New Brunswick’s Historic Downtown Walking Tour. Whose heritage is being observed through the walking tour? Who was involved in identifying points along the walking tour and by what process were they selected? Is there a heritage theme that could be
connected to other points of interest outside of the downtown area and that could provide opportunities for residents to create business opportunities for themselves? Depending on the university and community entities involved, the respondent’s proposal could be a way for Rutgers and the City of New Brunswick to collaborate and engage the broader community through tourism.

In spite of local critiques, the New Brunswick campus appears to have managed to at least garner national recognition for its community engagement efforts, as has Rutgers-Newark. Both campuses are designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Both campuses appear on the 2010 Presidential Honor Roll for Community Service. Both campuses also have invested in promoting themselves as engaged with surrounding communities, though perhaps with some differences in the messaging, particularly with regard to tourism planning and development.

As a culmination to the series of internal community partnership meetings, in late-2010, Rutgers University President Richard McCormick and Richard Cahill, Mayor of New Brunswick, convened a joint town-gown relations summit that involved representatives from Rutgers-New Brunswick and from an array of community entities including local schools, businesses, and neighborhood-based nonprofits. In February 2011, Rutgers-New Brunswick posted the following position description on the university’s human resources website that, due to its content and competitive salary, generated discussions in both New Brunswick and Newark among those who are interested in community engagement research and administration.
Reports to the Senior Director, Office of Community Affairs, Department of University Relations. Serves as the key liaison and relationship builder between Rutgers and community organizations in the city of New Brunswick, township of Piscataway, and neighboring towns; is responsible for developing, launching, implementing, and sustaining meaningful collaborations and partnerships. . . . Promotes and develops opportunities for Rutgers to use its resources to address critical New Brunswick issues. Tracks and enhances the efficacy of existing initiatives and partnerships within the community. Works with the president of the university and his community engagement leadership team, to develop and manage agendas and priorities for local outreach. Conducts periodic surveys in the community and university; ensures all parties adhere to best practices for conducting research and programming with community partners. Develops, oversees, and disseminates various communication materials including the Community Engagement website, and maintains information about Rutgers partnerships in local communities. . . . Prefer masters or doctoral degree; Spanish proficiency and familiarity with New Brunswick and local communities.

A Rutgers cooperative extension faculty member who participated in search committee meetings for the Director of Community Engagement position reported that final candidates were identified by the end of the spring 2011 semester; however, as of this writing, the position has not yet been filled. Due to a subsequent announcement in May 2011 that President McCormick would be stepping down in 2012 to return to faculty, the position may not be filled for some time, at least not until Rutgers has a new president at the helm.

Some five years before the posting of this position, Rutgers-Newark had transformed its Campus Information and Conference Services department into the Office of Campus and Community Relations (OCCR). OCCR was charged with “advancing broader institutional efforts to strengthen ties between Rutgers and Greater Newark” through the department’s original campus visitor information and conference and event services units. Then, in the fall of 2010, OCCR was renamed the Office of University-Community Partnerships. This new
office retained much of the same responsibilities as OCCR; however, much like the Director of Community Engagement position posted by Rutgers-New Brunswick, OUCP’s newly minted Assistant Chancellor for Community Partnerships was charged with “brokering partnerships for faculty community-based service learning and research initiatives, as well as developing processes for cataloging activities and outcomes for institution-wide community engagement initiatives” (Rutgers-Newark Office of University-Community Partnerships, 2010, p. 5).

![Figure 24. Rutgers-New Brunswick’s Community Engagement Program Directory webpage (left), launched in early 2011, lists over 80 facilities, programs and events that the Department of University Relations has qualified as community engagement. Available at http://communityengagement.rutgers.edu/programs-services/program-directory/a-z. Rutgers-Newark’s 2010-12 community engagement brochure (right) lists – programs and events. The brochure has been published biennially since 2005. Available at http://www.newark.rutgers.edu/community/partnerships.pdf. Both accessed March 15, 2011.](image-url)

Based on the content of the current directories that both campuses produce (see Figure 24), it appears that Rutgers-New Brunswick applies a more expansive definition or set of criteria to community engagement than Rutgers-Newark. Both campuses include various programs that are addressing “needs more urgent than tourists” in the eyes of the New Brunswick resident quoted previously (see p. 153), including community service opportunities
like Slam Dunk the Junk and Scarlet Day of Service; environmental research projects like the Sustainable Raritan River Initiative and the Highlands Environmental Research Institute; and tutoring programs like America Reads/Counts and Tutoring Plus. The Rutgers-New Brunswick directory, however, also includes “Culture, Arts, & Entertainment” attractions, destinations, and events like the Zimmerli Arts Museum, the Geology Museum, and Rutgers Day – an “annual community event [that] has attracted 200,000 visitors to the university to enjoy hundreds of free programs” since 2009 (Rutgers Today, 2011). Coupling such facilities and events with community engagement suggests Rutgers-New Brunswick’s gradual movement towards framing its tourism planning and development mechanisms as forms of public service. While Rutgers-Newark’s community engagement publication promotes campus-based attractions and events like the Marion Thompson Wright Lecture Series, which has drawn thousands of visitors to Newark over the past 30 years, and the Institute of Jazz Studies, there is evidence to suggest that the Newark campus also is positioning itself to inculcate tourism-as-engagement practices.

The community engagement administrative projects on both of these campuses provide a context for clarifying how PLGU tourism planning and development activity is emerging as a community engagement tool among higher capacity PLGUs. Below is a comparative analysis of the New Brunswick and Newark campuses’ tourism planning and development mechanisms, the extent to which they incorporate community engagement-oriented place marketing strategies, and the complex interplay of placemaking concepts including community collaboration, power conflicts, place competitiveness, and destination image formation.
**Campus visitor information at Rutgers-New Brunswick.**

Campus visitor information in New Brunswick takes on two forms: (1) RU Info, which is a call center- and web-based information resource administered by Campus Information Services and (2) the Office of Undergraduate Admissions’ Rutgers Visitor Center, a $7.5 million, 12,000 square foot stand-alone facility completed in 2009 and located across the Raritan River from New Brunswick in Piscataway next to Rutgers Stadium.

Campus Information Services in New Brunswick helped to form CIVSA in the mid-1990s. Interestingly, despite longtime involvement, leadership, and expertise in this area, the department does not oversee the Rutgers Visitor Center, which is a functionary of New Brunswick’s undergraduate admissions office.

Though the Rutgers Visitor Center is funded by the university’s undergraduate admissions office, it constantly interfaces with external tourism entities. It maintains a partnership with the Central New Jersey CVB, and its administrators plan to compete for a cooperative tourism marketing grant through the New Jersey Department of Travel and Tourism. Moreover, the Visitor Center was designated as one of 20 official New Jersey visitor information centers within two years of its grand opening in October 2009. According to a Rutgers-New Brunswick employee in public relations:

> Because there really isn’t any real official New Jersey center in the area, it definitely benefits central New Jersey also because now there’s a landing space. There is some place where tourists who are coming to the state can stop and pick up information on restaurants in New Brunswick or hotels, things like that. So, it is going to benefit all of central New Jersey and all of the state. . . . The Rutgers students will staff it. We view them as no better way to represent the university. . . . the New Jersey Department of Travel and Tourism is going to do some additional training to familiarize them with things throughout the state, as well as customer service training for them. (Personal communication, Jan 31, 2011)

A few visits to the Rutgers Visitor Center during the spring 2011 semester yielded pleasant, professional greetings from student ambassadors on staff and invitations to view interactive
exhibits about Rutgers as well as to partake of conveniently located displays stocked with state-, county-, and city-level travel materials.

**Campus visitor information at Rutgers-Newark**

The Campus Information Center at Rutgers-Newark has been in existence since 2001 with the establishment of the Campus Information and Conference Services department. Like Rutgers-New Brunswick’s Campus Information Services department, the Campus Information Center is primarily a student-staffed unit featuring an integrated call center and booth facility located in the Paul Robeson Campus Center. With oversight from the aforementioned Office of University-Community Partnerships (OUCP), the unit is being renamed Campus and Visitor Information Services to reflect the addition of community area tourist information that will complement OUCP’s Conference and Event Services unit as discussed below.

**Conference and event services at Rutgers-New Brunswick.**

Rutgers-New Brunswick recognizes the economic impact that visitors can have on the surrounding community; therefore, it frames conferences and events as forms of community engagement (see Figure 25). According to university officials interviewed for this study, conference and event management at Rutgers-New Brunswick is somewhat dispersed during the academic year, with some schools and departments handling their own arrangements. Schools and departments that do seek external planning expertise tend to utilize the Continuing Studies Conference Center because its services and guest rooms – offered at $59-69 per night – are affordable for limited university budgets. Because Rutgers-New Brunswick faculty departments tend to use the Center for conferences, the Center is said to host visitors from all over the world, sometimes for multiple weeks. A member of ACCED-I and Unique
Venues, the Center’s guest rooms also are available to visitors and travelers as a public service.

There also is a Conference Services division within Rutgers Housing and Residence Life. This division primarily works with university departments and community non-profit organizations that wish to host conferences and events at Rutgers during the summer months. This division becomes the primary centralized entity for conference and event planning and space reservations during a time of year when the university can generate significant revenue from underutilized facilities.
According to a Rutgers-New Brunswick staff member in hospitality services, cooperative marketing of Rutgers facilities may become an official partnership effort between the university and the local CVB that ostensibly will generate revenue for the institution, provide meeting space to community members and visitors at a reasonable cost, and ultimately develop pride in the university as a community partner and placemaker:

One of the things we are working on is a marketing cooperative for on-campus facilities, because there are so many facilities on campus where someone can have meetings and events. And they each have their own little specialty, their own little niches. So, there’s the Visitors Center, but that’s only available nights and weekends. And then there are athletics facilities that are available to rent, you know the RAC [Louis Brown Athletic Center] for trade shows, the stadium for concerts. And then there is student center meeting space. The Zimmerli Museum rents out space. But all of these venues have limited usage . . .

We are working on getting all of us together as a marketing cooperative, having Rutgers catering involved . . . generating one brochure that would highlight all of us. So when we meet with the convention and visitors bureau to do a familiarization tour, we have some collateral material to give to them so that people know that there are venues available on Rutgers campus. This facility gets a lot of business referrals from the convention and visitors bureau. Sometimes I can’t accommodate them here but maybe another facility can. . . . We can refer business to each other . . .

[The brochure is] a piece that people can walk away with, an information tool that someone could go to a website to say, “Wow, I didn’t know the campus centers were rentable.” People don’t always know that, and they are. It’ll benefit the university, it’ll benefit the community, but overall beyond the revenue just bringing people to campus will have long term benefits. We want to bring people to Rutgers. We want them to come to our sporting events. We want them to come to the museums. We want their kids to come here. That’s what all it comes down to; we want the area to be proud of the university. (Personal communication, Jan 4, 2011)

As a caveat, with Rutgers having a major physical and geographic presence in New Brunswick and Piscataway, by marketing conference space, event planning, and catering services at lower costs, the university could undercut local businesses. Moreover, from public relations and policy standpoints, the university could be criticized for working outside the scope of its tripartite mission. If Rutgers-New Brunswick conference and event services
entities decide to implement a marketing cooperative, it may be a prudent measure to apply education, research, and service criteria to facility usage policies. University Housing in New Brunswick enforces such policies for its summer conference services division which works strictly with nonprofit organizations whose conferences are educational in nature.60

**Conference and event services at Rutgers-Newark.**

The OUCP Conference and Event Services unit guides faculty, staff, and students through the planning and hosting of conferences and special events on campus and in the broader community. The unit also makes event management expertise available to community organizations and entities that work in partnership with Rutgers-Newark. In conjunction with the Campus and Visitor Information and Community Partnerships and Engagement units, OUCP provides welcome services to visitors who are affiliated with conferences and events being held at Rutgers-Newark.

The marketing cooperative concept has been considered as well within OUCP Conference and Event Services for similar reasons expressed by the respondent in New Brunswick. This indicates that conference and event planning and management is being viewed as a community engagement mechanism at Rutgers-Newark as well, though there has yet to be a partnership established with the Newark/Elizabeth CVB.

**Cooperative extension tourism at Rutgers-New Brunswick.**

Cooperative extension faculty at New Brunswick’s Cook College – the historic agricultural campus at Rutgers – were involved with the 2010 National Extension Tourism Conference as part of the conference planning team and/or as presenters. As mentioned

---

60 As mentioned in Chapter 3, conference and event services operations at other PLGUs – like the McKimmon Conference Center at North Carolina State University – also are mandated to work solely with external entities whose conference and events advance the institution’s research, teaching, and/or public service mission.
previously, cooperative extension faculty also have partnered with North Carolina State University to provide five agritourism webinars. The webinars reportedly garnered over 200 participants in more than a dozen states including North Dakota, Nebraska, Georgia, and Connecticut (Rich, et al, 2011). According to an agritourism expert interviewed for this study, offering the webinars presents a promising economic diversification opportunity to New Jersey farmers and their communities:

[The webinars] and extension practitioners help farmers to get more involved with agritourism . . . Many farmers are excellent at production; however, now we’re talking about an entirely new business paradigm for them where they’re bringing in visitors to their farm. It obviously has a production component but it also has a service and hospitality component that may not be familiar to them.

In New Jersey, you’re sitting in one of the most densely populated corridors in the nation. There are 30 million people probably within a 100 mile radius from where we’re sitting today. So obviously the market opportunity is there. . . . we’re trying to help farmers understand the transition needed to successfully engage in tourism and attract them. Again, it has to be about marketing, hospitality, service provision, customer service and so forth. . . .

What we need to see is higher value or value added products coming off those farms including product service diversification. . . . Farmers in New Jersey have an opportunity and it lies in the fact that we have consumers all around us. It tends to be a very affluent consumer market. So what we need to do is help them make the migration towards diversifying their products and services in terms of adding value. Do you want an apple? Or do you want apple cider or apple sauce or some of these other kinds of physical translations of the product. Do you want an experience? . . . we see a tremendous movement of consumer interest being drawn back to the farms to see where their food comes from. (Extension faculty member, personal communication, Jan 4, 2011)

Rutgers-Newark has a cooperative extension presence; however, agritourism is not a specialty area due to the campus’ urban emphasis.

Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements at Rutgers.

As mentioned previously, Rutgers-New Brunswick has more tourism-related attractions and facilities than the Newark and Camden campuses combined. With regard to
capacity enhancements, the New Brunswick campus features the Continuing Education Conference Center with guest rooms; the Zimmerli Art Museum and Geology Museum; and a campus-based 18-hole championship golf course that is open to the public.

During the course of conducting interviews, a local tourism professional revealed that Rutgers-New Brunswick has plans to develop a corporate hotel as part of renovation and expansion efforts on Livingston Campus in Piscataway. While the respondent indicated that the statement was based on “hearsay,” the respondent was certain that plans had been discussed in the recent past. Even more certain was the sense that the new hotel and conference facility could impact departmental budgets and, due to competition and/or duplication of services, also could precipitate the closing of the Continuing Education Conference Center on Douglass Campus.

It depends on who you talk to. Last week, it was one word, next week, it was another – it was originally going to be a conference center and a hotel. I’ve also heard stories that it will be separate now, run by two different management companies. Then I heard it was off the table – the budget crisis and because they couldn’t find a flagship management company to agree to their terms. . . . I don’t know what the terms are – and I don’t believe that university departments will be required to use it. If you look at other universities, some of the universities that have properties require and mandate that their departments use that property. . . . The feedback from some Rutgers departments is that they’re not happy. There’s been talk about possibly closing the Continuing Studies Conference Center. I think people will miss it if they do. (Personal communication, June 4, 2011)

A few conflicts arise with this proposal. First, closing one conference hotel facility that has been a part of fulfilling the public service mission of the university in order to gain a new, externally managed conference hotel facility could cost university departments (and the community at large) much more in the long run, particularly if they are mandated to use the property for academic conferences. This also could be problematic for Rutgers-New

61 Details about plans for Rutgers-New Brunswick’s “Vision for Livingston Campus” which includes the possibility of a “major chain hotel/convention center” are available at http://visionforlivingston.rutgers.edu/, accessed July 26, 2011.
Brunswick as it attempts to strengthen ties with the city. A new hotel on Piscataway’s Livingston Campus potentially signals competition with downtown New Brunswick hotels like the Hyatt and the Heldrich rather than collaboration. Of course, because the hotel and conference center likely would be clustered with the Rutgers Business School complex that is being developed on Livingston, the university could argue that the hotel would serve an education and research function for faculty and students. Such an explanation might make better sense, however, if Rutgers had an academic tourism/hospitality program. Indeed, the inventory analysis performed for this study indicates that an academic tourism program is the one tourism planning and development mechanism that the university does not feature; otherwise, Rutgers would be considered a Level IV capacity PLGU.

Perhaps as a final testament to a culture of elitism that is said to permeate the flagship campus of this “Public Ivy” PLGU, when one respondent was asked why Rutgers does not have an academic tourism program, the response was quite simple: “We’ve talked about it for years. From what was told to me, I guess maybe it wasn’t prestigious enough.” (Rutgers-New Brunswick employee in hospitality, personal communication, Jan 6, 2011)

Case Study II: Public Land-Grant University Tourism Planning and Development in Question: Alcorn State University and the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area

Alcorn State University is an historically black 1890 PLGU located in Alcorn, MS, equidistant from two Southern antebellum cultural heritage destinations: Vicksburg, MS, and Natchez, MS (see Figure 26). Founded in 1871, Alcorn State is the oldest historically black PLGU in the U.S. According to the institution’s “Brief History” adapted from Posey (1994), Alcorn State was “founded as the result of the people of Mississippi’s efforts to educate the descendants of formerly enslaved Africans” and “named in honor of the sitting governor of
Mississippi, James L. Alcorn,” who, ironically, was a “slave holder,” “unapologetic white supremacist,” and all-around “scallywag” according to a Mississippi-based higher education expert interviewed for this study (Personal communication, July 14, 2011).

![Location map, Alcorn State University in Alcorn, MS. Available at http://www.alcorn.edu/about/default.aspx?id=567, accessed July 15, 2001.](image)

Despite a negatively associated namesake and “limited resource allocations from the state,” Alcorn State is said to have “thrived by continuously accomplishing dynamic goals and objectives.” Among these suggested goals and objectives are becoming “a more diversified university” that educates students from “more than 65 counties, more than 30 states and at least 18 foreign countries”; growing in “status and importance” by advancing a statewide ideal of “educating all citizens”; and fostering an administrative leadership and faculty culture that
is “committed to restoring and enhancing the institution’s image and to attracting young people whose interest is the pursuit and receipt of a quality education.” Indeed, through its history telling, the institution ultimately depicts itself as “the college that excelled against all odds” to become “one of the leading universities in the nation.”

Interestingly, though the institution touts its status as the oldest historically black PLGU in the nation, there is little evidence in its history-telling that cooperative extension or any other form of public service and outreach has figured prominently in the institution’s development and/or interactions with communities that it is mandated to serve. The title of Posey’s 216-page chronicle, *Against All Odds*, perhaps is telling: like many other historically black 1890 PLGUs, decades of limited state support has led to tough decisions regarding resource allocation. As a national higher education authority interviewed in New Jersey for this study explains:

> No duplication of services is one of the main goals when allocating federal and state monies. For land-grant institutions, these funds generally come in the form of a block grant. Governance and autonomy play important roles in defining and guiding duplication of services goals for these universities. Institutions that have more autonomy like Southern University in Louisiana, an 1890 school with its own system that is separate from historically white Louisiana State University, is not as susceptible to duplication of services rules. An 1890 school like Prairie View A&M has to tow to Texas A&M, because they are in the same system. The system’s board of trustees and president decide which institution is going to do what and the resources that they will receive in order to carry out their work. They are not going to have institutions in the same system doing the same thing. That would be a waste of resources, and the 1890 schools historically have had to work with limited resources. (Rutgers faculty member, personal communication, April 17, 2011)

Alcorn State pales by comparison in size and resources to Mississippi State University, its historically white public land-grant counterpart on the eastern side of the state bordering Alabama. With a student body of approximately 3,800, Alcorn State covers 1,700 acres (it

started with 225). Conversely, Mississippi State, a Level IV capacity PLGU, is the largest university in Mississippi with a student population of nearly 20,000 and with grounds comprising about 4,200 acres, including farms, pastures, and woodlands of the Experiment Station. The net investment in buildings and grounds is approximately $450 million. Agricultural research is accomplished on the MAFES Plant Science Farm comprising approximately 560 acres of land, 10 greenhouses, and 43 structures, and on the MAFES Animal Sciences Farm, which has 1,650 acres and 52 structures.63

Though neither of these institutions is located geographically in the Mississippi Delta, as the only PLGUs in Mississippi, they are mandated to serve all areas of the state. Of the two public land-grant institutions, Alcorn State was selected by legislative mandate to become a partner in the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area Partnership.

Based on the tourism planning and development mechanisms included in this study, Alcorn State is a Level I capacity PLGU due to its recent involvement in expanding a destination farmers market in Natchez, MS, for tourists as well as for training local residents on how to plant and grow vegetables (Mask, 2011). Challenged by a history of limited state support and with fewer human and facility resources than its PLGU counterpart, why was Alcorn State University selected to be a Mississippi Delta NHA partner instead of Mississippi State University?

National Heritage Areas: regional partnership policy and cultural heritage tourism practice

The National Park Service (NPS) works in partnership with designated areas voluntarily identified as culturally distinctive yet quintessentially American. These National Heritage Areas (NHAs) are generally regional in scope and can involve partnerships among government, education, and community-based entities within the defined region.

Cultural heritage tourism development is not one of the goals of NHA policy at the federal level. Indeed, the National Park Service (NPS) describes a NHA as a place designated by Congress where natural, cultural, historic and scenic resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. These patterns make National Heritage Areas representative of the national experience through the physical features that remain and the traditions that have evolved in them. Continued use of National Heritage Areas by people whose traditions helped to shape the landscapes enhances their significance.64

A primary goal that emerges from this policy definition is cultural heritage landscape conservation; nowhere in the definition is it suggested that cultural heritage tourism is a preferred means to that end or an end in and of itself. In fact, there is considerable controversy surrounding the environmental and social costs that are exacted upon regions that adopt tourism as a development strategy (Deitrick, et al., 1999). While exploring in detail the fault lines of this debate is not within the scope of this study, it bears mentioning here as a way to illustrate the point that NHAs may represent federal devolution in its purest form. By definition, these regional areas are valued for their uniqueness and are recognized for their ability to garner local support for a common cultural heritage identity. Herein, regions are encouraged to be autonomous in their respective preservation management approaches. The NPS neither makes nor carries out management decisions; rather, its role is as “a partner and advisor, leaving decision-making authority in the hands of local people and organizations.”65

Indeed, Peskin observes that in successful NHAs, the NPS “is involved for a finite period of time, typically with planning, organization of a management entity, helping to identify unifying themes for interpretation and furnishing of grant monies.” (2001, n.p.) Hence,

---

64 From a National Park Service policy statement presented to the House of Representatives in October 1999, as quoted in Hart (2000). According to Hart, the policy was in an effort to make Congress aware of feasibility and local buy-in issues that should be addressed before granting NHA status.
65 From “What is a National Heritage Area?” NPS website
The heritage area concept offers an innovative method for citizens, in partnership with local, state, and Federal government, and nonprofit and private sector interests, to shape the long-term future of their communities. The partnership approach creates the opportunity for a diverse range of constituents to come together to voice a range of visions and perspectives. Partners collaborate to shape a plan and implement a strategy that focuses on the distinct qualities that make their region special.66

While it is clear that NHA designation involves cooperation among local, regional, and national entities, the NPS makes it especially clear that NHA designation is a grassroots, bottom-up process that begins with locally-driven coalition building. It is expected that these local coalitions are formed in order to preserve a shared cultural heritage that commonly is defined in terms of regional boundaries (Bray, 1994; Hart, 2000). NHAs, then, are regional partnership efforts that begin with local collaboration.

While cultural heritage tourism is not the stated goal of NHA designation at the federal level, regions often use the NHA designation as a means to enhance established or emergent cultural tourism development initiatives. As suggested previously, tourism is often criticized as a dubious economic development strategy, particularly for rural and/or economically distressed regions. Over the past decade, the conjoining of community economic development and the tourism industry has been of considerable interest among researchers (see, for example, Bramwell and Sharman, 1999; Jamal and Getz, 1994; Joppe, 1996; Reed, 1997; Tosun, 2000), perhaps in an effort to channel the economic power of tourism in more socially responsible ways. Cultural heritage tourism as a distinct form has been praised in this sense. Peskin (2001) maintains that successful NHAs use cultural heritage tourism as a way to generate widespread interest in a region – which in some cases does more to protect cultural heritage than regulatory measures – and to accomplish broader regional economic development goals. Peskin’s claims are not at all far-fetched, as cultural heritage tourists tend

---

66 From “What is a National Heritage Area?” NPS website
to be the most loyal to their chosen destinations. In addition to their tendency to be more highly educated than the general public and, thus, higher in earning power, cultural heritage tourists are known to spend more money while on vacation and to stay longer. They are also more likely to stay at hotels and to shop and dine at locally-owned establishments in an effort to experience the authenticity of a destination, which contributes to the local economic base (Silberberg, 1995, p. 363). Small wonder that cultural heritage tourism is the fastest growing segment of the industry; clearly, regions that offer attractive cultural products stand to profit from this relatively elite form of travel.

Yet, cultural heritage tourism has its controversies. As mentioned in the literature review for this study, one salient issue is that of contested or “dissonant” heritage, which is derived from the idea that heritage is socially constructed knowledge. As such, heritage is open to a variety of interpretations and meanings, all of which are subjective. Moreover, as a form of knowledge, heritage is sometimes difficult to capture. It can be physically or conceptually tangible (e.g., cathedrals, palaces, transport artifacts and national parks) or intangible (e.g., languages, music, dance, rituals, food and folklore) (Graham, 2002, p. 1004). The meanings that we attach to these tangible-intangible aspects are always malleable and diverse and depend upon temporal and spatial contexts. Thus, within localities that attempt to package heritage for sale and consumption, issues arise with regard to who owns the heritage, who defines it, and who profits from its production. This inherent “dissonance” within heritage emanates from the use of heritage as a knowledge commodity that is consumed and interpreted simultaneously by tourists and locals for different and sometimes conflicting reasons Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996).

At a workshop on “Implementing a Research Agenda for National Heritage Areas,” officials and affiliates of the NPS engaged in a “dynamic” debate regarding dissonant
We lack clear consensus on cultural policy and the concept of heritage. The group debated heritage as a construct, about conflicting values in cultural landscapes, and about the implications of assigning a new cultural identity to people and places. Are we commodifying heritage? It may be time for us to question these things.67

The question about how heritage is conceptualized is a crucial one, especially in regions like the Mississippi Delta where heritage is likely to be interpreted through multiple and conflicting lenses. Human subjectivity and diversity of experience can explain this, of course, but the South’s violent history of race-, socioeconomic-, and gender-based conflict cannot be ignored as a source. Clearly, although NPS policy establishes that NHA regions are responsible for defining local heritage, the stated concern with “assigning a new cultural identity to people and places” could raise eyebrows from a political economic perspective.

Despite its policy effort to empower localities with the ability to define and manage their own cultural heritage identity and image, could the NHA program be critiqued as passing (or devolving) the power buck – that power being the ability to define heritage identity – from the federal to the local and regional levels? Is the idea that local coalitions should be responsible for managing regional heritage identities a form of regime building? To what extent are these coalitions producing a valid regional cultural heritage identity based upon NPS’ stated goals of public involvement, widespread support, and commitment from all regional stakeholders?

These are questions that the NPS attempts to address, if only indirectly, in its NHA designation criteria protocol.68 Hart (2000) provides an overview of the criteria that are used in a rigorous suitability and feasibility study that regions ostensibly have to pass before

---


68 The NHA designation protocol by the National Park Service is available at http://www.cr.nps.gov/heritageareas/REP/criteria.pdf.
meriting NHA designation by Congress. The criteria imply a cultural heritage tourism development process that involves

- broad-based, sustainable collaboration (e.g., “managed as such [sic] an assemblage through partnerships among public and private entities and by combining diverse and sometimes noncontiguous resources and active communities”; “the management entity and units of government supporting the designation are willing to commit to working in partnership”);

- bottom-up consensus building (e.g., “a conceptual boundary map [of the region that] is supported by the public”); and

- inclusive, interorganizational participation (e.g., “residents, business interests, non-profit organizations, and governments within the proposed area are involved in the planning, have developed a conceptual financial plan that outlines the roles for all participants . . . and have demonstrated support for designation of the area”) (p. 32).

**University involvement with the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area Partnership**

The Delta Regional Authority was established by U.S. Congress in 2000 “after years of commissions, task forces and study groups” to serve 252 predominantly rural counties and parishes in eight states along the southern portion of the Mississippi River that “make up the most [socioeconomically] distressed area of the country.” Below are a few statistics reported by the Delta Regional Authority to describe the region:

Of the 252 counties and parishes served, 250 have per capita income levels at or below the national average.
The poverty rate in the region is 55 percent higher than the national rate.

Compared with the national rates, deaths in the Delta from circulatory diseases are 21.2 percent higher, deaths from cancer are 12.7 percent higher and deaths from accidents are 42 percent higher.\(^{69}\)

In 2001, yet another study was conducted of the sort described by Hart (2000). The National Park Service (NPS) released a “Draft Heritage Study and Environmental Assessment"\(^{70}\) containing strategies for encouraging economic development in the Mississippi Delta region through cultural heritage tourism and preservation. The specific purpose of the assessment was “to provide guidance to Congress for implementing sections 1103 and 1104” of Title XI – Lower Mississippi Delta Region Initiatives.\(^{71}\) The Delta Initiatives legislation was passed by Congress in 1994 based upon a “compelling” study conducted by the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Commission in 1990. This study was somewhat different from others in that its celebratory analysis of the Delta’s natural and cultural elements suggests an assets-based versus an issues-based approach (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993). The Commission’s study depicts the Delta as a region permeated with rich physical, social, and cultural resources. In light of this, a primary recommendation of the NPS assessment was the designation of the Delta as a National Heritage Area (NHA).

The Mississippi Delta NHA was passed by U.S. Congress and signed by President Obama as part of the Omnibus Federal Land Management Act of 2009. Nearly a decade of planning and policy expertise went into distilling cultural heritage tourism and preservation

---


\(^{71}\) In brief, the two sections of the Delta Initiatives legislation are summarized thusly in the “Legislative Requirements” section of the NPS assessment: “Section 1103. Prepare and transmit to Congress within three years a study of significant natural, recreational, and cultural resources in the Delta region. . . . Section 1104. Prepare a plan within three years after funds are made available that establishes a Delta Region Native American heritage corridor and cultural Center; a Delta Region African-American heritage corridor and cultural center; and a music heritage program with specific emphasis on the Delta blues. This plan would also propose a network of heritage sites, structures, small museums, and festivals in the Delta region . . . .”
concepts for the eight-state Delta study region into a manageable framework for an 18-county subregion within the state of Mississippi (see Figure 27). Section 8008 of the Act provides detailed guidelines regarding the boundaries of the Mississippi Delta NHA and a board of directors governance structure with 15 representatives appointed by regional arts, humanities, tourism, economic development, and educational stakeholder organizations. Three of these

---

**Figure 27.** Maps of (1) the 44 counties covered by the Delta Regional Authority and (2) the 18 counties of the Mississippi Delta NHA as defined by the legislation with approximate locations of Delta State University and Mississippi Valley State University, two of three higher education partners in the Mississippi Delta NHA Partnership. Mississippi Delta NHA map is available at http://www.blueshighway.org/mdnhacontymap.gif, accessed July 14, 2011.

---

72 As stated in Chapter 2, the Delta Regional Authority, a federal economic development entity established to improve quality of life of Delta residents, defines the region as encompassing counties and parishes in Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee. Available at http://www.dra.gov/about-us/eight-state-map.aspx, accessed on July 16, 2011.
stakeholder entities are public universities, two of which are located geographically in the region: Delta State University, an historically white institution in Cleveland, MS, and Mississippi Valley State University, an historically black institution in Itta Bena, MS. As stated previously, the third institution, Alcorn State University, a Level I capacity PLGU, is located outside the boundaries of the Mississippi Delta NHA region.

To reiterate, NHAs are not necessarily designed to promote cultural heritage tourism in their regions, though many of them do. There are two other NHAs in Mississippi, the Mississippi Gulf Coast NHA and the Mississippi Hills NHA, the latter of which is managed predominantly by CVBs throughout the region. As reflected by the diverse composition of its board, the Mississippi Delta NHA, by contrast, aims to

> foster partnerships and educational opportunities that enhance, preserve and promote the heritage of the Mississippi Delta. Our goal will be to represent all the people of the Delta and their interests and needs. We want to insure a balanced and sustainable approach to community and economic development and social transformation. The Partnership will create links between the people and institutions of the Delta that will promote those activities that improve, protect, and advance the understanding of the Delta's important past and its contributions to the American story.73

Indeed, cultural heritage tourism is not stated as an emphasis of the Mississippi Delta NHA, though tourism entities are involved and cultural heritage tourism is being boosted as an outcome of the NHA designation. Both economic and educational benefits of cultural heritage tourism are being discussed among community members in the Delta, which substantiates the active involvement of universities as partners, if not leaders, in the planning and management of the NHA. At the 2010 Delta Dialogue, an annual regional development summit sponsored by Mississippi Action for Community Education (MACE), President and CEO Clifton

---

Wheatley made introductory comments that reflect local appreciation of cultural heritage tourism and multi-layered benefits it can bring to the region:

Just less than a year from now in May of 2011, we're going to have visitors from all over the United States – and possibly from all over the world – to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the freedom riders who played a pivotal role as a catalyst to move forward the objectives of the Civil Rights Movement. And these were young people. These were nineteen, eighteen, twenty, twenty-one year old students who, some of them, took breaks from their studies from universities all over the United States to join a movement. To change history. To change the world. . . . Their final destination was in Jackson, Mississippi. They were arrested there. And most of them ended up being transported to Parchman Penitentiary here in the Mississippi Delta. . . . It's important that young people and people in general, become more educated about the history that took place. And a great way to highlight this is through cultural heritage tours.

. . . there's such a great opportunity here, an opportunity for economic development around cultural heritage tourism. And it's a two-fold opportunity. On the one hand, we can have tourists come here to the Mississippi Delta from all over the United States and from all over the world. And also, this is an opportunity for people to learn. Not only for visitors to learn, but also for our local people to learn. I've been talking with some people recently about the lack of knowledge that so many of our people right here in the Delta have about their history, about their culture, about their heritage. . . .

We are trying to organize more opportunities like this so people can learn. . . . with that education, we'll be in a much better position to take advantage of the opportunities to bring visitors in; to attract visitors based on our civil rights history, based on blues culture, and based on all the great visual and literary artists. Our great soulful, beautiful culture here in the Mississippi Delta. (MACE, 2011, emphasis added)

Mr. Wheatley’s assertion that cultural heritage tourism is a “two-fold opportunity” to integrate regional economic development with visitor and resident education creates opportunities for Mississippi Delta NHA university partners to engage visitors and surrounding communities in a variety of ways. It bears mentioning that MACE is a rural development corporation that manages the Mississippi Delta Blues and Heritage Festival in Greenville, MS, “the largest blues festival in the Delta and the oldest in the United States” according to the Mississippi Delta Tourism Association, a network of nine municipal- and county-level CVBs in the region
MACE actually cites the festival as the second oldest in the country. Regardless of this discrepancy, the festival’s social and economic impacts since its inaugural convening in 1978 are perhaps testaments to the power of cultural heritage tourism as a form of community education and engagement:

Ironically, black and poor people from the Mississippi Delta, who gave the world the Blues, had limited access to traditional or contemporary institutional arts and cultural programming. The products of most rural peoples’ art are inaccessible to them. They are housed in urban academic institutions and archives.

MACE has significantly increased knowledge of and pride in the blues as a distinctive form of the Mississippi Delta’s arts and culture.

The first Mississippi Delta Blues Festival was more of a community gathering than a musical concert. It, along with the next nine Festivals, was held at Freedom Village, a

---

rural community of less than 100 people which showed what was wrong with poverty and the programs designed to remedy poverty.

In a chronically poor region, the Festival provides an economic boost contributing nearly three million dollars annually to the local economy. The economic impact of the Mississippi Delta Blues and Heritage Festival represents only a fraction of the revenue that blues-related cultural tourism can bring to the region.76

Luther Brown, director of Delta State University’s Delta Center for Culture and Learning, and Marvin Haire, director of Mississippi Valley State University’s Delta Research and Cultural Center, both provide regional bus tours for visiting groups such as Wake Forest University students and Teach for America corps members. They also conduct lectures and training sessions for youth and local professionals such as public school teachers who are integrating cultural heritage themes into their curricula.77 Dr. Brown is a former chair of the Mississippi Blues Foundation and is a founding member of the Mississippi Blues Commission by gubernatorial appointment. He also is an active advisor to the statewide Mississippi Blues Heritage Trail and the new Freedom Road civil rights trail. Dr. Haire is a member of the Mississippi Blues Commission and has chaired of the Glendora Heritage Advisory Council, the site of the lynching of Emmitt Till. Both Dr. Brown and Dr. Haire represent their respective institutions as members of the Mississippi Delta NHA Board of Directors (University faculty members and local museum employee, personal communications, Aug 16 and Aug 17, 2010). Both also gave speeches at the 2010 Delta Dialogue sponsored by MACE.

---

Dr. Brown’s comments suggestively affirm Mr. Whitley’s observations about the combined benefits of education and tourism-oriented economic development by framing the concept as a regional competitive advantage, while Dr. Haire’s comments invite community audiences to consider potential social consequences of adopting cultural heritage tourism as an economic development strategy.

Dr. Brown: The mission of Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area is to foster partnerships of educational opportunities. And that make us slightly different from some other National Heritage Areas that are very specifically focused only on heritage tourism. We are trying to, as it says, enhance, preserve, and promote the heritage of the Mississippi Delta. And that means, that rather than simply focusing on tourism, we're also, focusing on things like educational opportunities for all the citizens of the Delta. We'll be focusing on things like preservation efforts. Trying to preserve historic structures that may be in danger of falling apart. And, we will also be, as he says, promoting the heritage of the Mississippi Delta.

Dr. Haire: We continue to hear this notion about money being made, and tourism being a drive and an economic force. For each situation that we run across, we have to ask ourselves to what extent have we organized ourselves to take advantage of an economic engine that has left the station? . . . One of the things that has to happen in this region is to relate quality cultural heritage tourism initiatives to community development in very, very precise ways. At the core of that is, how do we do this in a way that improves the quality of life of local residents? . . . This requires what we call action research. Fielding teams of individuals who come together and agree to research, examine, implement, intervene and move something in a particular way. . . . So, the issue for us then, is how to structure economic development and tourist initiatives. Does that revenue translate into programs that are going to improve the quality of life for individuals in these particular communities? (MACE, 2011)

Themes of aggressive action vs. critical thought; capitalistic enterprise vs. communal interest; readiness vs. ill-preparedness; and connectedness vs. disconnectedness are embedded in these comments and point to sources of conflict in the Mississippi Delta NHA planning process. Indeed, Dr. Brown and Dr. Haire appear to be individuals who lead organizations that have the necessary programming and networking capacity to engage fully in the NHA planning process. Their expertise, professional positions, board activities, social networks, and active physical presence in the region give each of them the option, the power, of toggling between
the aforementioned juxtaposing themes. Certainly, there may be positive or negative consequences associated with donning a different demeanor – or face, as Goffman has it, from a symbolic interactionist perspective – depending on the social setting; however, I learned during this field visit to the region that such behavioral shifting characterizes the NHA planning process in the Delta.

I had the opportunity to observe various individuals involved with the NHA planning process who assumed on-stage and off-stage demeanors in formal and informal interviews, at community and dinner table meetings, and in their professional (e.g., office) and personal (e.g., home) milieux. Through my observations, I recognized that those who were perceived as having power in the placemaking process also were considered to be most apt at assuming different demeanors, at code-switching. This practice is viewed by some residents as a contributing factor to a culture of “political games” that permeates the Delta based on personal and professional associations, race, socioeconomic status, and even place of residence. As one respondent who works in high-level regional economic development circles in the Delta remarked:

Everybody says that people in the Delta don’t work well with each other. And, you talk to people in Cleveland and they say, “Well, I wouldn’t go to Greenville. They’re all a bunch of thieves, and Clarksdale, everybody there are thieves,” and you go to Greenville and everybody there says the same thing about the others. There’s a real lack of trust . . . The towns around the Delta have that same kind of mistrust. A lot of it is Deltans play these political games. . . . To figure out what’s really going on, you have to look at people’s interests. People will be real sweet to each other, talk real nice, and can’t wait to stick a knife, and go to great lengths to do that. . . . It’s going to be a big challenge for the Heritage Area to unite the region. I think a lot of people see the value of that, but it’s the culture, and people always go back to their culture, and culture is something that they don’t recognize. If it’s to the level of culture, it means that they just do it without even realizing what they do. . . . I hate to say that but it really is; it’s a nasty culture in so many ways. It’s this culture of privilege for a very few and absolute misery for many – and people here love it. (Community development researcher and administrator, personal communication, Aug 17, 2011)
To extend the culture of deception from individuals and municipalities to the NHA organization itself, despite the fact that the planning process is supposed to be community-driven with broad-based local input, it is not perceived that way by some residents. One Greenville resident who attended the NHA Board of Directors meeting on Wednesday, August 18, 2010, shared the following insights regarding their view of the planning process:

Community driven – humph, whatever. I think the fact that the governor’s representative is the chairperson [of the NHA board] bothers me off the top. How’d you get that position and why is that okay that the governor’s representative and appointed person gets to be the chair? Who voted? I never saw that process, and I’m a member of the community, and I’ve just not been made privy to how that happened. How did that happen? Nobody can explain that to me. And then the fact that Delta Council are the caretakers, the filters and the people who receive all the information, and distribute it however they see fit. . . . It has nothing to do with fairness, integrity, honesty, respect, they don’t care about any of that. . . . the sad part is that that’s the message that they send, want us to believe that they’re very concerned – blah-blah. But, then, behind the scenes, it’s absolutely not true because if it was, the schools would not be in the situation that they’re in. The health concerns of this community would not be in the situation that they’re in. This is all due to poverty, disenfranchisement, a deliberate hands-off approach because if they really cared, we wouldn’t see this. Because they have all the money. They have all the power. (Personal communication, Aug 19, 2011)

Though the respondent never directly clarified who “they” are, the general tenor of the comments suggests strong perceptions of insider-outsider dynamics in the NHA effort and the Mississippi Delta in general.

Alcorn State University, by contrast, reportedly has had minimal involvement with planning and development efforts related to the Mississippi Delta NHA. During an August 2010 field research visit to the region, several respondents confirmed that even though the NHA Board of Directors had held meetings during that year, a representative from Alcorn State had yet to attend. This prompted me to ask why Alcorn State had been included as a partner, particularly since it was not geographically located in the region and the two other university partners that are geographically situated in the region already had been actively
involved for years. Several respondents attributed the decision to Congressman Bennie Thompson, who has been a strong supporter of the Mississippi Delta receiving NHA designation for several years. One educator and community activist who resides in Greenwood, MS, remarked affirmatively:

Alcorn has satellite facilities. The Delta has residents who attended Alcorn, because many of the HCBUs [historically black colleges and universities] are attended by people who live in the MS Delta. So that’s why they’re part of the heritage. So you cannot exclude the HCBUs because they have a silent presence in the MS Delta region. You have to include them. The black story is not told. The only ones who can really tell the story are those it has affected. . . . You wouldn’t have history without struggle. Those who were in the struggle are being left out to tell the story of the heritage. (Personal communication, Aug 19, 2011)

The roles of racial representation and of perceived authenticity in heritage interpretation are key factors in Alcorn State being invited to the proverbial NHA planning table. This likely would explain why the historically white PLGU, Mississippi State University, was not included as a university partner despite its considerable educational resources, its statewide public service mandate, and its greater tourism planning and development capacity. Certainly, these attributes would serve an institution well in the Mississippi Delta NHA given the fact that its mission suggests a coalescing of education, community engagement, and cultural heritage tourism. Another respondent’s comments reinforce the perceived importance of racial representation and authenticity with regard to who benefits economically from the commodification of a group’s heritage:

. . . there’s a long story of African-American and white relations where blacks produce and whites capitalize on it; and I’m sure that that’s part of what’s going on here. . . . there’s a dispute about that and among the board of the Heritage Area as well. . . . black members are concerned, are very concerned and aware of that issue…not just with the blues but with the Heritage Area in general, and they are clear that this has to be run by the local community. . . . It’s the same old story. Kind of privileged white, business people, their world view consists of economic competition and they don’t really see the world from the perspective of somebody who is poor and faces all these burdens and barriers. Those type of things squash people and prevent them from taking advantage of opportunities. They may have produced something that is great,
but they face so many burdens because of their skin color, because of their social class . . . somebody else can just come in, market it and have all that savvy and connections and everything; and, the people that don’t have that don’t understand. (Indianola, MS resident, personal communication, Aug 17, 2011)

Despite these signs that Alcorn State’s involvement would have been welcomed and viewed as critical in the Mississippi Delta NHA planning process, the institution generally was viewed by respondents as a non-entity. As such, this 1890 PLGU’s power to engage and actively reshape a community’s story that it is mandated to serve appeared to be in jeopardy. A member of the NHA board expressed absolute dismay with Alcorn’s absence and seeming indifference:

I’m very concerned and disappointed with the fact that Alcorn hasn’t been – I don’t think they’ve been to one meeting. The universities, especially HBCUs, they should be all over this like white on rice. The reason being: history is made by those who you serve. The children of the Delta have walked their halls and they have become somebody. Alcorn should have a really major role. They should be on top of this to say, “Okay. This is what we feel.” (Personal communication, Aug 17, 2011)

Since the fall 2010 field visit to the Delta, Alcorn State has appointed a NHA board representative who began to attend meetings in 2011. The board representative is a retired political science professor who is described as “congenial” and “cooperative” with “not much to say” (NHA board member, personal communication, July 18, 2011), perhaps because he still is becoming acclimated to the board’s processes. On the other hand, as a representative of a Level I capacity PLGU, he also may be limited in his ability to marshal the university’s already limited resources to engage in a regional cultural heritage tourism, education, and preservation partnership like the Mississippi Delta NHA. As a retiree from Alcorn State, the board representative could not be reached through university channels to respond to this study, so any explanations regarding his absence during the first set of board meetings would be speculative.
It is anticipated that Alcorn State will continue to participate in the Mississippi Delta NHA Partnership. Whether or not that participation will take on a character of direct advocacy and activism on behalf of oppressed voices as suggested by previously quoted respondents remains to be seen. As a final word, the educator and community activist from Greenwood, MS, acknowledges that NHA board members will not simply have to grapple with a history of race oppression when planning for the telling (and/or perhaps selling) of the Delta’s heritage but with a history of general socioeconomic oppression as well that crosses racial lines and, though the respondent does not mention it, of gender oppression as well.

If you’re gonna tell the story of the Delta, the story being told: all about the slaves, the mistreatment – this is what the heritage is based upon in the Delta. It’s not all a black story because you had the poor Caucasians – they were treated about the same but they were a little different because of skin color. . . . That’s the story. There’s another story that I don’t hear anyone talking about. You go from poor black to rich white. What happened to that other group in between? There is a group in between. . . . You can’t sugar coat the story of those who have suffered misfortune. People get turned off. So, when folks come from foreign countries and other parts of this country into the Delta for tourism, they’re looking for the facts. Even if you don’t want to tell it, they’ve already read it. (Personal communication, Aug 19, 2011)

**Summary of case studies**

The foregoing case study analyses suggest that PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacity are more likely to be promoted as powerful placemakers in their communities. Rutgers University’s flagship campus is an example of a Level III PLGU that appears to wield placemaking power in its municipality and region through community engagement marketing. Indeed, Rutgers-New Brunswick frames itself as fulfilling its public service mission through mechanisms and capacity enhancements featured in this study including festivals like Rutgers Day; publicly accessible events, hospitality, and lodging venues like the Rutgers Visitors Center and the Continuing Studies Conference Center; and campus-based attractions like the Zimmerli Arts Museum and the Rutgers Golf Course. Such
community engagement marketing appears to dovetail with local and regional tourism marketing materials that advance the institution as a placemaking entity. Partnerships with external tourism organizations like local CVBs and the state tourism office appear to support this.

Based on insights from employees, however, Rutgers-New Brunswick may not be realizing the full potential of its tourism planning and development assets due to an expressed need for more collaboration internally and externally, particularly with the local community. There appear to be efforts to address both of these issues by creating a campus-based marketing cooperative of conference and event venues and by making events like Rutgers Day more inviting to the local population. With plans to transform its Livingston Campus into “a sophisticated and vibrant community focused on professional study” with a possible “major chain hotel/convention center,” 78 those within the university who have discussed the creation of a tourism studies department may view this as a window of opportunity to advance the conversation; however, the likelihood that a tourism program will be established at Rutgers is unlikely as the university continues to grapple with shrinking state support. Moreover, with public institutions like Richard Stockton College in Atlantic City already featuring a tourism and hospitality management program within its business school (http://intraweb.stockton.edu/eyos/page.cfm?siteID=150&pageID=66), duplication of services between two state-supported higher education institutions could become an issue as indicated by a previously quoted higher education expert.

Rutgers-Newark is a smaller campus in New Jersey’s largest city with campus visitor information center and conference and event services functions that are administratively a part

---

of the Office of University-Community Partnerships. Herein, its tourism planning and development mechanisms are considered forms of community engagement; however, the Newark campus appears to have its own impediments with regard to activating the placemaking potential of these mechanisms fully through capacity enhancements. Unlike the New Brunswick campus, neither of these mechanisms is involved with local tourism organizations like the Greater Newark/Elizabeth CVB or the Meadowlands CVB. Its relationship with the New Jersey Office of Travel and Tourism has been limited to distributing tourism marketing materials, which it does sporadically. Unlike its New Brunswick counterparts, it is neither a member of CIVSA nor ACCED-I, which are organizations that could enhance the programming and networking capacity of these units. Rutgers-Newark’s two cultural exhibition facilities – the Paul Robeson Galleries and The Institute of Jazz Studies – are marketed as local visitor attractions by the university and by some external tourism entities; however, perhaps due to their locations and lack of signage, they may be less accessible to visitors than they could be otherwise.

As a Level I capacity PLGU, Alcorn State University’s involvement with the Mississippi Delta NHA Partnership appears to be quite limited, particularly in comparison to two public non-land-grant universities that are geographically located in the region. Based on observations and interviews conducted in the region, Delta residents – particularly African-Americans – were expecting the institution to address endemic dissonant heritage issues in the region. Since the Partnership is in its early stages, perhaps they hold on to this expectation. Indeed, of the three higher education institutions involved, Alcorn State is most apt to maintain a stance of critical distance: it is located outside of the Delta region and yet, as part of its PLGU public service mission, it has a stake in helping to ensure that the NHA lives up
to its goal “of representing all the people of the Delta and their interests and needs.” 79 This, of course, remains to be seen as the Partnership works towards developing a management plan with the leadership of Delta State University, the designated local coordinating entity. As such, Delta State is legislatively responsible for preparing and submitting the management plan to the Secretary of the Interior, as well as implementing the plan in collaboration with government, regional planning organizations, non-profits, businesses, and individuals throughout the region, particularly with regard to “encouraging, by appropriate means, economic development that is consistent with the purposes of the Heritage Area.” 80 Whether or not Alcorn State asserts itself as an economic development resource through cooperative extension tourism or some other means is one of several possible topics of further research that the final chapter of this study summarizes.

Chapter V.

Summary of Key Findings and Conclusions

The evidence presented in this study demonstrates that at some PLGUs, the campus-based tourism planning and development mechanisms under investigation are engaging communities with an awareness that their work is helping to fulfill the public service missions of their institutions. Some campus visitor information centers are expanding beyond recruitment and admissions functions to serve as campus and community greeting and meeting spaces. Some campus-based conference and event services are being promoted as more than income diversification strategies to help fill institutional budget gaps as they report community and regional economic multiplier effects of attracting visitors and encouraging them to consume local attractions, products, and culture. Some cooperative extension tourism programs are transcending the traditional one-way outreach paradigm by combining their expertise with external tourism and economic development entities, as well as other universities, to facilitate community-based train-the-trainer workshops and to develop interactive online toolkits and webinars that reflect input from academicians, professionals, and end users.

The evidence presented in this study also suggests that these tourism planning and development mechanisms are being promoted as forms of community engagement. This research project did not aim to identify the reasons for this, per se, as that is a topic for further research; rather, the study set out to clarify how institutional capabilities are being socially constructed through language and images that create perceptions of placemaking power and community engagement. Through various analyses – primarily semiotic website reviews, interviews, and direct and participant observation – the study illustrates that placemaking and university-community engagement have become inextricably tied in a 21st century era of
accountability that challenges higher education institutions to demonstrate their worth and relevance to broader society.

Finally, the evidence presented in this study demonstrates that these community engagement promotional efforts appear to be more prevalent among PLGUs that are perceived as ranking among leading, elite research universities in the U.S. PLGUs that are adept at promoting themselves as engaged placemakers through tourism planning and development mechanisms are positioning themselves for sustained public support as well as long-term survival. If state budget cut trends continue and the public continues to demand proof that research universities and other higher education institutions are contributing to the greater good, PLGUs that are perceived as engaged placemakers – the ones actively enhancing quality of life in surrounding communities and helping them to be more competitive in regional, national, and global destination marketplaces – will likely have a marked advantage over PLGUs that are not perceived in this way. I concede that university-community tourism engagement, as I am inclined to call it, has gone largely unnoticed. Yet, it is happening nonetheless, and its practices have broader implications for universities and communities that have the capacity to promote themselves effectively as engaged placemakers, as well as for those that do not have the capacity to promote themselves as engaged placemakers.

Summary of key findings with suggestions for further research

Based on a national inventory of PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development, the study proposed a five-tiered taxonomy of PLGU tourism planning and development capacity ranging from Level IV (highest) to “Not Applicable” or “N/A” (lowest). The results of the taxonomy may be summarized according to the following primary themes that suggest associations among perceived institutional prestige, race, and geographic
location with regard to PLGU tourism planning and development capacity. As noted previously, to draw any definitive conclusions regarding these potential associations would be premature, particularly since this study aims to outline possible areas of further research. Statements regarding possible associations are based solely on observation at this point. Statistically significant testing would be warranted to demonstrate it.

**Higher capacity PLGUs and capacity “trendsetters.”**

Virtually all of the PLGUs that are perceived as ranking among the nation’s elite universities also rank as institutions with greater tourism planning and development capacity (Level IV and Level III). These elite PLGUs were identified based on membership with the AAU and/or designation to Greene’s (2001) list of “Public Ivies.” All 16 AAU-member PLGUs included in this study rank either as Level IV or Level III capacity institutions. Of the 14 “Public Ivy” PLGUs, 13 (93%) rank either as Level IV or Level III capacity institutions. The study observes that Level IV and III institutions are among the leading innovators of PLGU tourism planning and development capacity.

Based on observations of tourism planning and development mechanism clustering among some higher capacity PLGUs, the inventory was augmented to include tourism-related facilities, namely campus-based hotels, museums, and golf courses. Of the 69 PLGUs included in this study, 20 were found to feature all three facility types with Level IV and Level III PLGUs representing a vast majority (18 or 90%) of the group. Of these 20 PLGUs, a majority (12 or 60%) are AAU members. Half are considered “Public Ivies.”

These key findings allow for the identification of a select group of institutions that comprise a separate tier of what I propose are tourism planning and development capacity “trendsetters.” This group may be worth examining further as models of PLGU tourism
planning and development activity. Table 26 lists a set of scoring criteria that were used to identify these capacity “trendsetters.” The scoring criteria are derived from the following: (1) tourism planning and development capacity levels and (2) tourism planning and development capacity enhancements, including relationships with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entities; memberships in professional and scholarly organizations involving tourism; and documented campus-based hotel, museum, and golf course facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 26. Scoring criteria for tourism planning and development “trendsetters”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism planning and development capacity levels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV – 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II – 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism planning and development capacity enhancements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with local/regional tourism policy and/or marketing entity (EXTORG) ; Note: PLGU must be positive for all three mechanisms documented (see Phase I analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership with the Collegiate Information and Visitor Services Association (CIVSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership with the Association of Collegiate Conference and Events Directors-International (ACCED-I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership with Unique Venues (UNIQUE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the 2010 National Extension Tourism Conference (NET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus hotel (see Table 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus museum (see Table 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus golf course (see Table 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM POSSIBLE SCORE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 contains a proposed list of top 20 capacity “trendsetters.” The table is organized thusly:

- Bold lines in the chart separate each group based on the number of capacity enhancements that they are found to have. Among these 20 institutions, the highest score documented is 10; the lowest score documented is 8.
- Level IV capacity “trendsetters” are distinguished with black backgrounds.
- Level III capacity “trendsetters” are distinguished with dark gray backgrounds.
- The one Level II capacity “trendsetter” is distinguished with a light gray background.

A visual overview of Table 27 reveals the following noteworthy patterns:

- All of the top 20 “trendsetters” feature golf courses.
- Nearly all (19 or 95%) of the “trendsetters” feature at least one museum.
- Out of 16 AAU-member PLGUs included in this study, 12 (75%) are “trendsetters.”
- Out of 14 “Public Ivy” PLGUs included in this study, 11 (78%) are “trendsetters.”
- AAU-member and “Public Ivy” PLGUs each comprise over half of the “trendsetters.”
- Though this study found the University of Connecticut-Storrs to be ranked as a Level II capacity PLGU, due to several capacity enhancements that it features, this “Public Ivy” ranks among the second tier of “trendsetters.”
- With regard to commitment to community engagement, a majority of “trendsetters” (16 or 80%) are dues paying members of Campus Compact and five (25%) were designated to the 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification.
- Several states with “trendsetter” PLGUs border each other, which appears to create a regional cluster effect (see Figure 29). Future studies may investigate policies and/or planning and development practices that help to explain such regional patterns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXTOG</th>
<th>CIVSA</th>
<th>ACCED</th>
<th>UNIQUE</th>
<th>NET</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Golf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia ♣E, CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University (IN) * CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University *</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University *</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University (SC) E E C C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey * ♣E, CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison ♣ ♣ ♣ ♣</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida-Gainesville * ♣ ♣ E E C C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California System * ♣ ♣ E C C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities * ♣ E E E C C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University * ♣</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut-Storrs ♣ ♣ ♣ ♣ E E E E C C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (NY) * ♣ ♣ ♣ ♣ ♣ E, CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University E, CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware ♣ CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois-Urbana ♣ ♣</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University ♣ ♣ CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - member of the Association of American Universities
* - “Public Ivy” institution
*♡ - Ivy League institution

E - named to 2010 Carnegie Community Engagement Classification
CC - member of Campus Compact
Figure 29. Map of 1862 land-grant universities in the 50 United States indicating tourism planning and development capacity “trendsetters” (“T”). Note three separate regional clusters (indicated with bold Ts), the first encompassing six Midwestern states (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin); the second, five Northeastern states (Connecticut, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania); and the third, four Southeastern states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina). Base map source: USDA NIFA, retrieved from http://www.nifa.usda.gov/qlinks/partners/state_partners.html#maps, accessed February 13, 2011.
As was reiterated throughout the Chapter 3 analyses, tourism planning and development capacity appears to be associated with perceived institutional prestige, which emerged as a key finding of this study. Commitment to community engagement also emerged as a key characteristic which is discussed further in the conclusion portion of this chapter.

**Lower capacity PLGUs.**

PLGUs with mid- to lower-level tourism planning and development capacity (Level II, Level I, and the “N/A” Level) are primarily historically black universities (also known as 1890 schools). Indeed, of the 18 historically black PLGUs included in this study, 17 rank among these levels. While these institutions are mandated to serve all communities in their states regardless of race, based on their historic charters, many of these institutions continue to serve the needs and interests of African-American communities, many of which are in rural areas. These communities and the universities that work with them may benefit from considering tourism development as an economic prosperity strategy based on collaborative planning, feasibility studies, and community visioning. In many of these communities, the 1890 schools represent spaces where community members (e.g., students, faculty, staff, residents, alumni) gather en masse to engage in traditions (e.g., family reunions, homecoming games, concerts) that create and reinforce bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000). Based on these observations, future studies could investigate the various capacities of 1890 institutions to facilitate tourism planning efforts in these particular communities.

Of the 9 non-historically black PLGUs that rank as Level II or Level I capacity institutions, a majority (5 or 55%) are located in historically depopulating regions such as the
Great Plains— which encompasses Kansas State University, Montana State University, South Dakota State University, and the University of Wyoming – as well as Alaska where ecotourism and cultural heritage tourism are being promoted (Popper and Popper, 2006). Rural communities in these states also could benefit from public service resources and expertise that higher capacity PLGUs appear to be developing in collaboration with their communities. Indeed, as with the 1890 schools, research could be conducted to ascertain the extent to which PLGUs located in the Great Plains states are perceived as and/or are capable of engaging as tourism planning and development resources in their communities.

Considering once again the list of proposed “trendsetters” in Table 27, the following patterns should be noted with regard to lesser capacity PLGUs, as well as PLGUs located in two economically distressed regions that have been discussed throughout the study:

- None of the historically black 1890 PLGUs rank among top 20 “trendsetters.”
- Of the 12 PLGUs that serve the 10 states in the Great Plains region, two (16%) rank among the top 20 “trendsetters”: Texas A&M University and Colorado State University.
- Of the 16 PLGUs that serve the eight states in the Delta region, two (12%) rank among the top 20 “trendsetters”: Auburn University in Alabama and the University of Illinois-Urbana.82

81 As stated in Chapter 2, the Center for Great Plains Studies at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln includes 10 states in the Great Plains region: Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. Map available at http://www.unl.edu/plains/publications/atlas.shtml, accessed on July 16, 2011.
Again, these patterns suggest that further research may be warranted regarding generally less competitive tourism planning and development capacity among 1890 PLGUs as well as PLGUs in the Great Plains and Mississippi Delta regions.

**Tourism planning and development at other research universities.**

Private and public-non-land-grant universities also were included in this study to help complete the national inventory of university-community tourism planning and development activity. To recap, these universities are considered to be fairly comparable to PLGUs by virtue of their membership with the AAU. Because they do not feature cooperative extension tourism programs, comparisons were made based on the three remaining mechanisms: campus visitor information centers; conference and event services; and academic tourism programs.

In general, PLGUs were found to have greater tourism planning and development capacity than their private and public non-land-grant university counterparts. Nonetheless, a few key findings emerged from their inclusion in the analysis:

- As with PLGUs, conference and event services was found to be the most common tourism planning and development mechanism featured among private and public non-land-grant universities. In fact, these institutions were found to feature conference and event services at a higher rate than PLGUs (85% vs. 74%). As Connell (1996, 2001) suggests, conference and event services is a viable revenue generating strategy for universities, particularly during difficult economic times. Aside from the fact that universities generally host a variety of conferences and events annually, the financial benefits of offering conference and event services and facilities to external entities may explain, at least in part, why so many universities are doing it. Cost-benefit analysis research could help to substantiate or refute this idea.
• With regard to golf course facilities, non-land-grant universities were unexpectedly outpaced by PLGUs, as only 23% feature them vs. 52% of PLGUs. Private universities, in particular, might have been expected to be on par (to employ golf terminology) with PLGUs in this area due to a general perception of the sport as a leisurely pastime that is enjoyed primarily in members only country club atmospheres like those featured at Stanford and Yale. The data here suggest, however, that PLGUs are making golf more accessible to the public, perhaps as a kind of recreational and visitor hospitality service. Another study could research this notion further, particularly in cases where PLGU golf clubs take on a private character which appears to be the case with Michigan State University.

• The University of Colorado at Boulder was the only non-land-grant institution that was found to have an academic tourism program. It also features more capacity mechanisms and enhancements than any of the 39 non-land-grant universities included in this study. The university may be worth investigating as a singular case study in this regard.

Conclusions

As suggested in Chapter 1, this study aims to begin a conversation that may foster further research about PLGU tourism planning and development. As a recap, below are the three research questions and guiding hypotheses that have shaped this inquiry. Each question and hypothesis is followed by a summary of conclusions.

Research question 1: How are PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacities distinguished from PLGUs with lower capacities?
Guiding hypothesis: PLGUs with greater tourism planning and development capacities tend to use place-based, community engagement-oriented images and language in their marketing, which is creating a level of innovation that relegates PLGUs with lower tourism planning and development capacities to a perceived state of lower placemaking status.

A primary concern underlying this research is the idea that PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development empowers some institutions and disempowers others as placemakers in their communities. The extent to which a university is able to demonstrate that it is helping to make surrounding communities better places in which to live and work and, in this case, visit, the more engaged a university may appear to be. Universities that have greater tourism planning and development capacity – monetary resources; political and social capital relationships with external tourism organizations and other universities involved in tourism-related activities; expertise and facilities for bringing together faculty, staff, students, community stakeholders, and national and global visitors – stand to benefit in various ways from the perception that this form of engagement creates. In particular, Level IV and Level III PLGUs tend to be affiliated with national professional organizations and scholarly networks that afford them the opportunity to enhance further their programming and networking capacity for tourism planning and development activity.

Conversely, universities with lower tourism planning and development capacity appear to be separate (read: divested) from rather than embedded (read: invested) in their communities, even though this may not be the case. Indeed, historically black 1890 universities, which are over-represented among lower capacity PLGUs, generally were found to be staunch members of Campus Compact whose students and faculty commit many hours of service to surrounding communities. Moreover, some of the 1890 schools highlighted in
this study – in particular, Fort Valley State University and a featured case study institution, Alcorn State University – promote their cultural heritage and event facilities as aspects of institutional public service. These PLGUs are involved in local and regional tourism planning and development initiatives that are contributing to the quality of life of communities that they are mandated to serve.

Yet, as higher capacity universities innovate continuously through programmatic enhancements and professional information networks, the efforts of lower capacity institutions pale by comparison. Invariably, lower capacity institutions are less likely to be in the position to offer the level of placemaking resources that their communities need in order to compete in regional, national, and global place hierarchies which higher capacity institutions and their places appear to define and command. Higher capacity PLGUs like Clemson University and Rutgers University are recognizing and reporting economic and educational benefits that their events and facilities contribute to surrounding communities. Again, this form of placemaking power may prove to be increasingly important as PLGUs and other higher education institutions are expected to demonstrate their contributions and worth to broader society.

Research question 2: How is PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development justified as a mission-driven activity?

Guiding hypothesis: PLGU involvement with tourism planning and development is marketed by PLGUs as a mission-driven form of public service that emphasizes three placemaking-oriented tourism approaches: cultural heritage tourism, ecotourism, and rural tourism.

Based on material reviews of over 150 websites for PLGU cooperative extension tourism, conference and event services, and campus visitor information centers, Level IV and Level III PLGUs in general were found to be at the forefront of advancing themselves as
placemakers through marketing efforts that promote their involvement with tourism planning and development as a form of community-engaged public service. Among higher capacity PLGUs, cooperative extension tourism emerged as the mechanism most used to communicate this involvement replete with agritourism, ecotourism, and cultural heritage tourism images and language. Conference and event services operations at these institutions appear to promote cultural heritage tourism and nature tourism in their communities through partnerships with local CVBs, chambers of commerce, and state tourism offices. Likewise, campus visitor information centers at Level IV and Level III institutions maintain relationships with external tourism entities; however, these mechanisms do not tend to promote the forms of tourism indicated in the guiding hypothesis.

Conversely, Level II and Level I capacity PLGUs were found to promote their involvement with tourism planning and development less as a form of community-engaged public service and more as ad-hoc project ideas that may or may not be implemented. West Virginia State University’s Greenbox ecotourism project and Kansas State University’s agritourism resource list stand out as examples of potentially viable projects that appear to be shelved. This likely is due to funding constraints, which further underscores resource disparities between lower capacity PLGUs and higher capacity PLGUs. Funding constraints also may be an impetus for Level II and Level I conference and event services operations to focus on selling their facilities and services with little evidence of external awareness. This implies an outreach-oriented, organization-set approach to tourism management where the “organization is thought to be the focal agency and other organizations and interests are considered to be external ‘publics.’” (Selin and Chavez 1995, p. 846). Level II and Level I campus visitor centers generally take on this character as well by focusing on admissions-
oriented functions rather than broader, community-engaged programming through partnerships with external tourism entities.

In resource-constrained environments, highly-structured and narrowly-focused approaches may be the most effective means to stay afloat so as not to give the appearance of mission creep. Indeed, lower capacity PLGUs may not allow their tourism planning and development mechanisms the “luxury” of exploring territories that appear to be beyond the literal scope of their missions – missions that are tied to “bottom-line” concerns like student recruitment, selling conference spaces, and cooperative extension strictly focused on tried and true service areas like agriculture and family and consumer sciences. Managing these matters may be the most that lower capacity PLGUs can handle given limited resources. If this is the case – and further research is warranted to confirm whether or not it is – I would argue that while focusing on bottom-line issues may preserve an organization in the short-term, doing so may stifle innovation and creativity over time. Herein, higher capacity PLGUs likely have the resources to innovate because they have both the operational and strategic aspects of their organizations covered while lower capacity PLGUs are attempting to maintain operations, at best. Shifting towards an external, community-engaged mode, thus, may appear quite difficult and even nonsensical when one’s visitors center or conference services operation is closing, as was found to be the case with Kentucky State University and the University of Wyoming, both of which are Level I capacity PLGUs.

Research question 3: What are reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development? Do benefits and drawbacks differ based on institutional capacity levels?

Guiding hypothesis: Reciprocal benefits and drawbacks of university-community tourism planning and development are rooted in concepts of placemaking which
include community collaboration or community power conflict; enhanced or inhibited place competitiveness; and positive or negative destination image formation. Because higher capacity level PLGUs are more involved in placemaking efforts in their communities, they are more likely to experience reciprocal benefits and drawbacks than PLGUs at lower capacity levels.

Conclusions that may be drawn from the Rutgers University and Alcorn State University case studies are admittedly impressionistic given the fact that the phenomenon under investigation is emergent and even somewhat amorphous, particularly on the ground level. With regard to Rutgers, it is fairly clear that the New Brunswick campus is an example of a Level III PLGU that appears to wield placemaking power in its municipality and region through community engagement marketing. The historic flagship campus appears to promote events like Rutgers Day and facilities like the Rutgers Visitors Center, the Geology Museum, and the Rutgers Botanical Gardens as attractions for community members and visitors alike. Attracting visitors is promoted as a boon to the local economy, as per the campus’ community engagement website. Tourism marketing materials reviewed for this study suggest that external communities acknowledge the placemaking power of Rutgers-New Brunswick.

Based on these observations, the New Brunswick campus is promoting its tourism planning and development mechanisms and facilities as forms of community engagement, making it a prime candidate for continued research as the practice continues to emerge and take shape. Indeed, some of the evidence collected through this study suggests that there are issues of power conflict between the university and locals which have potential implications for a conference and event marketing cooperative concept in the short term and for New Brunswick’s place competitiveness and overall image as a destination in the long term. Again, this study primarily set out to lay groundwork for further research in this emerging area of
inquiry. With possible plans for a new corporate hotel and conference center that could threaten the existing Continuing Studies Conference Center, a campus-based visitors center that has been designated recently as a state tourism entity, and a presidential search underway that could alter the university’s community engagement efforts, the New Brunswick campus is teeming with research possibilities in this area. Thus, a definitive conclusion that may be drawn at this time is that Rutgers-New Brunswick should continue to be monitored as an engaged placemaker and tourism planning and development capacity “trendsetter.”

Rutgers-Newark is roughly three times smaller than the New Brunswick campus in terms of its student body, 20 times smaller in terms of facilities, and 70 times smaller in terms of acreage. Herein, Rutgers-Newark is much less likely to have the local and regional placemaking power of its flagship counterpart. In light of this reality, what this Level II capacity campus lacks in size may be supplemented through a few capacity enhancements that it could activate easily. Perhaps by joining professional organizations like CIVSA and ACCED-I, as well as advertising available event space on Unique Venues, the campus could promote its competitive advantage as a node for visitor activity and as a conference and event venue that is located less than five walking minutes from downtown attractions like the Newark Museum and the New Jersey Performing Arts Center. Those five minutes also could be spent on the city’s light rail system, which connects to Newark Penn Station via the Northeast Corridor transit system, a mere fifteen minute train ride to New York City. By promoting its location as a primary asset – which it appears to embrace judging from the pride of place that exudes from its community engagement publication – Rutgers-Newark may be able to help reconstruct the image of a city for outsiders who, due to recent shootings and other violent crimes, may be reconsidering previous reports of an urban renaissance there.
Finally, as stated previously, Alcorn State University’s involvement with the Mississippi Delta NHA Partnership has been limited as of this writing. As with Rutgers, there likely are more developments to come, especially since the Mississippi Delta NHA Partnership currently is in the process of crafting its management plan. Based on interviews and observations in the NHA region, the continued involvement of all three universities – including Delta State University and Mississippi Valley State University – should be watched, as each has the potential to contribute to placemaking in the region, particularly as those leading the process are defining it in terms of integrating education and economic development. As stated by Luther Brown, director of Delta State University’s Delta Center for Culture and Learning, the National Park Service did an analysis of the lower Mississippi region in 1996. And their conclusion, which they put in very large letters on a single page, is “Much of what is profoundly American, what people love about America, has come from the Delta, which is often called the cradle of American culture.” And that's a very profound statement. . . . There are people all over the world who want to come to the Mississippi Delta, because they realize the significance of the Delta. Not only to American culture, but to the culture of the western world. . . . And when these people come, they spend money. And we want them to come so that they learn. But we also want them to come so that they will bring money from where their coming from and leave their money here when they go back home. So there is both an educational opportunity here and an economic development opportunity here. (MACE, 2011)

As this study illustrates, the opportunity to integrate education with economic development is being realized through university-community tourism engagement. Universities, particularly PLGUs, have the potential to be venues for shared learning experiences between campuses and the communities that they are mandated to serve, for involving community partners in campus and civic life, and for creating win-win situations in the enlightened self-interest of the institution. By attracting visitors and by helping residents to develop the capacity to plan for, greet, and host visitors, they have the potential to help
create pride of place for faculty, staff, students, and residents; to help create opportunities for
career and workforce development; and to help raise awareness of the importance of
(re)creating, preserving, and celebrating place identity – their environments, their cultures,
and their people.
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