5. Within-Case Analysis of the Case Studies

Theoretical frameworks for tourism attraction development are few. Notable amongst them are the ones proposed by MacCannell (1976), C. Gunn (1988), N. Leiper (1990), G. Wall (1997). Most other authors look at tourism attractions from an analytical point in terms of analyzing them from their functioning / marketing point of view rather than a developmental point of view. The case studies are being analyzed from the developmental frameworks proposed by the authors mentioned above except Wall (1997), as his framework is more geographically oriented in terms of spatial expansion of attractions.

The objectives of this within-case analysis are:

a) To see whether there is any deviation from the theoretical frameworks in so far as the attraction development is concerned.

b) To identify patterns, if any, in the developmental process of the attraction.
5.1(a) Analysis of the Case Study on "Ancestral Goa", using MacCannell's attraction development framework.

According to MacCannell (1976) a tourist attraction has basically three components, viz. Tourists, Site and a Marker. He further goes on to elaborate the process of development of an attraction using the "Site Sacrilisation" process. He identifies five steps to site sacrilisation.

1. **Naming:** Occurs when a site is differentiated from similar objects as worthy of preservation.

2. **Framing and Elevation:** Occurs when a boundary is identified around the site and visitation is permitted.

3. **Enshrinement:** Occurs when on-site markers are venerated or given importance.

4. **Mechanical Reproduction:** Occurs when acceptance by visitors is exhibited by mechanical reproduction of the site in terms of artifacts / souvenirs.

5. **Social Reproduction:** Occurs when society recognizes the importance of the attraction from a social point of view and gives it recognition by naming societal aspects after the attraction. E.g., Roads, Places, Buildings, Parks, etc.

Ancestral Goa is a man-made attraction at Loutolim, a village in the peripheral areas of Goa. It was conceived and designed by Mr. Alvares.
who is the owner of the attraction. He graduated from the Goa College of Art and has an avid interest in art and sculpture. "Ancestral Goa" as an attraction was conceived by him when a tourist whom he met mentioned that Goa had nothing to offer but the beaches and the churches / temples. This statement made Mr. Alvares think about the different cultural aspects of Goa and he decided to design and recreate a village of Goa as it was 100 years ago under the Portuguese rule. Tourists who come to Goa generally visit the churches and the temples that are ancient, but there is no site that can depict Goa as it was during the Portuguese rule that ended in 1961. Keeping this in mind, Mr. Alvares spent about 2 years in research alone, to design "Ancestral Goa". He then set about to recreate an ancestral village of Goa, as it was 100 years ago, complete with actual life-size sites and houses and statues. It depicts a typical village of Goa as it was during the Portuguese rule in Goa. The depiction is done in seemingly natural surroundings and comprises of sites that show the typical socio-economic village life. The entire concept development-execution aspect of this attraction can be analyzed using MacCannell's framework of attraction development. The analysis shows that the first two steps of "site sacrilization", Naming and Framing & Elevation physically took place simultaneously as this attraction was conceived and designed, rather than identified as worth preserving. One may argue that the "Naming" for a "Heritage Attraction" is
something that has been identified earlier as in the concept of “Heritage”. Ancestral Goa is a depiction or morphological development of that concept. As the theoretical framework basically looks at the physical development of an attraction through the process of site sacrilization, one can say that the first two steps simultaneously occur in this case. There is a certain delay that is presupposed between the first and second stage of site sacrilization. This is because MacCannell’s framework pre-supposes a potential attraction that is waiting to be identified as worth preserving. The framing and elevation occur only after activities such as mapping, photographing, preserving etc are done to permit it to be “visited” by tourists. In case of Ancestral Goa the only delay between the first and the second stage as per the framework is due to the fact that “Ancestry” as a concept is already “Named” in the sense of a “quest” for the authentic or a “nostalgia” of the past and “Ancestral Goa”, as a physical depiction of that abstract “Naming”, came into being after the framing and elevation stage occurred. There is evidence that the site sacrilization process need not necessarily show a particular chronological path according to the stages. In a case of the development of North Cape the stage of “Mechanical Reproduction” was the second stage itself (Jens Jacobsen: 1997).

The third stage of “Enshrinement” in Ancestral Goa took place when the Limca Book of Records recognized the 14-meter long horizontal statue of
the Indian saint Meerabai, as the longest in India. This was sculpted by Mr. Alvares himself and is an onsite marker at Ancestral Goa. Moreover the "Big Foot" legend is also gaining ground and Ancestral Goa is creating a more interactive aspect for this on-site marker. The "Big Foot Legend" is an imprint of the right footprint of a human being who performed penance seeking the grace of God. He was a generous person who donated all his wealth to the needy villagers and was, over a period of time, reduced to a penniless person. He then sought relief from God as no one whom he had helped in their hour of need came to help him in his hour of need. After performing the penance and seeking God's grace he refused God's offer to punish the ungrateful people whom he had helped and restore his past glory. The legend is that anyone with a "pure heart" after stepping onto this footprint will have his or her wish granted. The legend is redesigned as an interactive point/site for creating an experience for the tourists. One of the aspects of creating this experience is a "temple-like" situation complete with brass bells and a small shed with the pictorial depiction of the story of the "legend". Some tourists offer coins of small denominations at the "legend" which is a sign of the experiential nature of the site. In Hindu tradition money is offered at temples, as a symbol of surrendering one's material desires.

The fourth stage of "Mechanical Reproduction" has been started by the attraction itself as a part of the process of promotion rather than as a
separate economic activity by the market forces. One reason for this could be that the attraction is a privately owned one and "Mechanical Reproduction" of the attraction may be considered the domain of the attraction itself rather than a public domain. No other firm is currently engaging itself in an economic activity such as mechanical reproduction of Ancestral Goa, probably because it is privately owned. In the case of Public Attractions such as Beaches, Waterfalls, etc. there could be economic activity of mechanical reproduction by entrepreneurs who could utilize the opportunity, resulting in the Mechanical Reproduction stage being advanced in the "site sacrilization" process. The fourth stage of "Social Reproduction" has not as yet occurred.

The framework as proposed by MacCannell fits natural attractions more as compared to man-made ones. The first two stages are part of the discovery of a natural attraction and the subsequent visitation that occurs due to the initial adventuring tourists who visit the site. Alternatively, on a planned approach, a site may get noticed or discovered and then the naming and framing/elevation stages could occur. This again reveals that the attraction is either a nature based one or one wherein the attraction potential is envisaged. e.g., excavated ruins, archeological sites etc. The framework does not seem to identify very well with man-made attractions in the "site sacrilization process". Moreover when one considers tourist attractions in peripheral areas like
where Ancestral Goa is situated, the framework offers no explanation to the developmental process. Attractions in peripheral areas by their very nature are attractions away from the central attraction at a destination. This increases the burden on the attractions to pull the tourists towards it as well as to push it through alliances with other players in the markets to explore possibilities of capturing a larger segment of the target market. It is imperative that the attractions in peripheral areas offer a more intense attraction consumption experience to the tourists or make them spend longer hours at the site with a variety of experiences that need not necessarily be intense in terms of experience. One can see such an exercise at the Ancestral Goa initially, wherein tourists had to spend about three hours for the "Ancestral Goa" experience.

MacCannell's framework of attraction development looks at the development of the attraction from the viewpoint of "visitation increase". The framework does not look at the kind of interventions that go into the increase of visitations that lead the attraction development through the various stages. The framework is more of a "post-facto" analytical tool rather than a planning tool for understanding attraction development. Organizational interventions, be they public or private, planned or emergent, forced or spontaneous, are not commented upon in the developmental framework by MacCannell. An attraction in the peripheral areas can reach the stages of Mechanical Reproduction and
Social Reproduction only if there is high visitation at the attraction. In MacCannell's framework, the concept of Mechanical Reproduction and Social reproduction come into the public domain after the attraction has gained sufficient exposure in terms of visitation. It is usually so when the attraction is "owned" by the public in terms of either management control with the public sector organizations or through the symbolic "ownership" of the attraction due to its "public" image, even though the management control rests with private organizations. The other attractions that do not have a "public" image and are not owned by public sector organizations end up with having the Mechanical Reproduction stage dominated by the management itself in terms of creation and sale of mechanical replicas of the attraction. This restricts the MR stage to the private owner/managers of the attractions. In order to create the "public image" of the attraction the attraction owners need to turn the attraction from an attraction in the peripheral area to a "flagship attraction" in the peripheral area. For an attraction in the peripheral area to attain a flagship status higher organizational inputs are needed. These could be in the form of alliances across various functional areas of organizations or could be collaborations with other players in the tourism industry. This was evident in the kind of linkage that Ancestral Goa has sought from the Tourism Department of Goa by way of getting enlisted on their guided tours as it became necessary for Ancestral Goa
to have a higher visitation number to make the attraction viable. This aspect of getting listed is quite important as it ensures a steady stream of visitors from the packaged tour. Such efforts are needed in the case of attractions in peripheral areas to enable them to succeed in terms of commercial viability. As the attraction is yet to gain popularity in the region in terms of higher visitation and renown, the stage of "Social Reproduction" would be far off in terms of time.
5.1(b) Analysis of "Ancestral Goa" using Gunn's attraction development framework.

Gunn (1988) has identified a three-part structure of a tourist attraction. This structure is basically a physical structure of an attraction but the development of the entire attraction is envisaged within this framework. It has a structure like this:

Here one can see that the core attraction is the Nucleus. It denotes the actual area occupied by the core attraction. An inviolate belt that denotes the setting or the theme of the attraction surrounds this. The inviolate belt is the setting within which the attraction is situated. The visitor reaches the nucleus only after passing through this setting / buffer space which basically conditions him / her to receive the attraction in the right frame of interpretation. The zone of closure denotes the limits of the
attraction and includes the surrounding commercial areas and local service areas. The development of an attraction takes place along these lines with the inviolate belt and the zone of closure expanding to allow for an expansion of the core attraction. Here we see a more physical developmental structure and hence only the physical developmental analysis of Ancestral Goa is discussed.

If one looks at the structure of Ancestral Goa, it has the core attraction spread over a landmass that enables the village scenario to be depicted. This becomes the core attraction with smaller statues/scenes becoming individual sites for experience consumption. The inviolate belt is the entire setting of the attraction itself. The theme of “Ancestry” is depicted well through the setting / inviolate belt within which Ancestral Goa is embedded. All individual sites such as the “Fisherman’s hut”, “Dona Maria’s Kitchen” etc., can be experienced through the inviolate belt. This belt has the strength to help the visitor to better appreciate the attraction i.e. the “core attraction”. In this case it is the details of village life in Goa as it was a century ago. Creating an inviolate belt that helps to experience the village life enhances this experience. In the earlier version of the product wherein Ancestral Goa entertained the visitors for a three hour visit to the various individual sites through a series of varied experiences that were associated with the individual sites helped the visitors understand the nuances of the village life much better. The
strength of such an inviolate belt increases the attractiveness of the attraction and also helps the product to differentiate itself from similar products. The Zone of Closure extends to the boundaries that Ancestral Goa has and there exists a dance floor, a restaurant and a gift/souvenir centre within this. This zone of closure has also been blended with the Attraction as the dance floor is in the shape of a "Big Foot" and is so named.

An analysis of this case from Gunn's framework of development reveals that the inviolate belt as it exists now is less effective in terms of its ability to enhance the appreciation of Ancestral Goa as compared to the earlier version of the product. The role of the inviolate belt in the earlier version of the product increased the visitor's experience as well as interaction with the core attraction in a better way as compared to the current version. The current version came about as a result of the changed market conditions and also to the owner-manager's realization to the commercial compulsions of managing the attraction. The decision to reduce the experiential value to fit the product to the changed market/visitor profile was at the cost of the changed value of the attraction itself. To a large extent the development of Ancestral Goa conforms to Gunn's structure but there are issues that indicate that weak links in the structure can reduce the value of the attraction. This seems like a contradiction, wherein to increase the visitation at an attraction in the
peripheral areas by creating the pull factor an attraction has to develop stronger links in the attraction structure such as a strong inviolate belt and a strong zone of closure. This in turn increases the investment on the part of the entrepreneur disturbing the economic calculations of managing the attraction. It is evident from the case that the entrepreneur had reduced the strength of the inviolate belt to accommodate the changed visitor profile. Attractions in peripheral areas have to use experience creation in order to draw visitors. Walk-in visitors are far and few in between as the attraction is situated in a peripheral area. Hence the structure for such experiential attractions would have to emphasize two parts, v.i.z., The Inviolate belt and the Zone of Closure. As Ancestral Goa is a high tourist involvement attraction, value addition to its existing product structure can be done either by adding more individual sites to depict the ancestral Goan village life or to increase the experientialisation of the existing product. This is now the developmental path that Ancestral Goa is envisaging to take. Some individual sites have been more experientialised already (the Big-Foot legend). One approach to increase the experience at an individual site is to increase the strength of the inviolate belt. In the case of Ancestral Goa the staged experiences or potential for staging experiences for the visitors using the attraction / site as the base is high.
5.1(c) Analysis of "Ancestral Goa" using Leiper's attraction development framework.

Neil Leiper (1990) identifies three elements that constitute a tourism attraction when their connectivity to each other is established. These are:

1. A Human Element or the Tourist
2. A Nucleus Element or an Attraction
3. An Informational Element or a Marker.

This framework looks similar to MacCannell's framework but differs in the sense that Leiper looks for a connectivity of the three elements to identify an attraction and also goes into the organizational aspect of attraction development by stating that a connection between these three elements would constitute an attraction. This essentially means a strong organizational input to create the connectivity between the tourist and the nucleus or central element by a proper product-market fit. The informational element is also a part of organizational input resulting in the information available to the tourists about the Central element. A connection between the Tourist element and the Central element is a prerequisite for an attraction to exist. This indicates that a product-market fit is needed for an attraction to exist. The organizational effort that goes into creating this product-market fit may be different for different stages
of the destination's life cycle resulting in either an emergent or planned product-market fit. Ancestral Goa has had to struggle with the right product-market fit in order to garner a higher visitation figure. A peripheral attraction like Ancestral Goa does not have control over the tourist market and has to take necessary steps to identify the right kind of market within the tourist inflow to make the “connectivity” work.

Leiper has categorised the second element (Nucleus Element) into primary, secondary and tertiary nucleus basically to identify a hierarchy of attractions based on ability to attract tourists and the awareness level of the attraction. A primary nucleus element is one that is the main reason for the tourist to visit the destination (E.g., Beaches in Goa). The tourist is aware of the primary nucleus element prior to his arrival at the destination. The secondary nucleus element is one wherein the tourist is aware of its existence prior to her arrival but is not the main reason for visiting the destination (E.g., the Churches / Temples in Goa). The tertiary nucleus element is one wherein the tourist is unaware of the attraction till she reaches the destination and then becomes aware of it either through on-site or off-site markers.

Most attractions in peripheral areas are either secondary or tertiary attractions and as such are not in a position to draw larger visitation when compared to the central attractions/ primary attractions. Hence designing of the product-market fit becomes a very important part of the
developmental process of a peripheral attraction. Since secondary and tertiary attractions are not well known awareness, if any, gets created amongst tourists only after their arrival. This results in a situation wherein no preferred market segment can be targeted by the attraction. Evolution of the attraction system at a destination based on this framework has to be hierarchical. This hierarchical evolution is also based on the Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) concept wherein the attractions and other players in the tourism industry display a spatial expansion away from the primary attraction.

It is seen from the case that the creation of the attraction was a result of the consumption of the creator's own ideas about what Goa should offer to tourists. This idea was then put up for public consumption through the creation of the attraction, which in turn was also a consumption process for the creator himself. This blurring of the consumption process of the creator's own idea of the attraction and the public consumption of the creator's idea through the attraction resulted in a mismatch of the product-market fit. This was not evident when visitation was permitted at the attraction but was more prominent when the focus of the creator shifted from his own consumption of the attraction to its commercial viability. It is at this juncture that the product changes take place along with the changes in the approach and market segment. Moreover the creator/entrepreneur would now be more concerned with the
commercial viability of the product rather than the consumption process and to whet his/her consumption appetite would look towards creation of other attractions. Mr. Alvares at this point was thinking of sculpting a vertical structure as another attraction after the success of his horizontal "Meerabai" statue at Ancestral Goa.
5.2 Analysis of the Case Study on "Hydrosports Ltd."

5.2(a) Analysis from MacCannell's framework.

Mr. Vincent Condillac and Mr. Riaz Ismail started Hydrosports (Goa) Pvt. Ltd. in 1990 as a private limited company wherein they pooled their talents and experience of two decades to build up the most successful Watersports Company in Goa. When they started off they had a desire to bring in the best of equipment and talent to give this industry the necessary boost and promote the culture of watersports in Goa. Hydrosports operates from the lovely bay at Cidade de Goa Beach Resort.

In the case of Hydropsorts Ltd., MacCannell's framework of attraction may not really be applicable, as the stages that he spells out are not seen in the development of man-made attractions. Neither the stages of "Naming" nor "Framing and Elevation" are exhibited here as the entrepreneur bases the attraction on the utilization of a natural resource with active managerial intervention. No "Mechanical reproduction" is seen nor is any "Social reproduction" seen in relation to the attraction. The argument could be that the attraction has not as yet reached any state of recognition to enable the last two stages of MacCannell's framework of attraction to be exhibited by it. Moreover the Mechanical
and Social reproduction possibilities in the public domain are diminished as the attraction is in the private business domain and both the stages mentioned above cannot occur if the attraction is privately managed and not highly successful and accepted by the public as a national or regional attraction. Usually natural attractions and heritage attractions are accepted as public property. This acceptance of the attractions as public property leads to a symbolic public ownership and hence mechanical reproduction and social reproduction seem to occur, both, for economic reasons in the case of the former stage and social acknowledgement in the case of the latter stage.

5.2(b) Analysis using Gunn’s framework of attraction development.

Hydrosports exhibits the core product or attraction of adventure sports using water / Sea as the base resource. It enhances the adventure / watersports experiences for the tourists using a variety of tools such as speedboats, jet-skis, surfboards etc., which forms the core of the attraction.

A very weak inviolate belt exists in this case. As the nucleus is the experience of watersports using a variety of tools / facilities it is intensely activity oriented. There is no inviolate belt designed in this case as the interaction of the tourists with the resource base is the major attraction to the tourists. There exists a very weak inviolate belt that enhances the
experience of the visitors. The only thing that is probably a mechanism to allow a better experience is the dissemination of specific skills needed to experience the attraction. The beach in itself as well as the other enthusiasts of watersports may to some extent fine-tune the experience. That in itself cannot be taken as a precondition to experience the attraction nor can it be designed due to the time constraints. Inviolate belts that are usually found in Museums, Heritage sites, etc. where one can better interpret the experience of viewing and cognition if one goes through some "conditioning" which is provided by the inviolate belt. Nature based interactive attractions that dwell on the experiences created by the interaction of the tourist and the resource cannot have a strong inviolate belt as it negates the process of "experience creation". The addition of tools to create the experiences for the tourists by Hydrosports was in fact a method of systematically taking the tourists closer to the resource for experientialising the product offering. Hydrosports steadily created a market for themselves through the increase of its product offerings that gave the tourists a variety of experiences to enjoy. There is no "Zone of Closure" in this case as the attraction uses the sea as the resource base and most of the attraction activity is on the sea itself. Hence there is no scope of any kind of "zone of closure" in the sense of the limits of that attraction. Technically however, Hydrosports regulates its
activities on the sea within a specified geographic limit or area limit as going far away into the sea could be dangerous to the guests in terms of the perils of the sea. Having said this the concept of the zone of closure enclosing the core attraction and having in its ambit the other developmental aspects such as restaurants, play-areas, parking lots etc., are seen at Hydrosports Ltd., as a part of the hotel Cidade de Goa. As the attraction is more activity based and needs little time to experience and enjoy, Hydrosports offered boat rides and boat excursions that lasted for either half a day or a full day from 9.a.m. to 5.00 p.m., thus enabling guests to spend a longer time in experiencing the attraction of a boat ride as well as by augmenting the attraction experience with some aspects covered under the zone of closure such as food etc., which was bundled as a part of the product offering itself. One can say that the concept of Zone of Closure though physically present can be shifted from one geographic location to another depending on the type of the attraction. In cases such as Theme Parks etc., where the geographic location of the attraction is fixed the zone of closure is also geographically fixed though it may exhibit an outward shift over a period of time during the life of the attraction.
5.2(c) Analysis using Leiper's framework of attractions.

Analyzing this attraction from Leiper's framework one can see that the attraction can be categorized as a secondary or tertiary nucleus. The entire marketing activity of the organization is focused towards making the potential guests aware of its existence and thereby creating a secondary nucleus status for itself. The organization uses the beach resort, where it is located, as the "information element" of the three-point attraction analysis proffered by Leiper. Hydrosports makes it a point to join the beach resort in its marketing efforts abroad thereby establishing the connectivity between the Tourist Element (guests) and the Nucleus Element using the beach resort as the Informational Element. In doing so Hydrosports is tending to restrict its market to potential international guests who may have the beach resort in their "consideration-set" when choosing their vacation destination. This need not necessarily be by choice or design but by lack of networking with the other players in the market. Though Hydrosports has the necessary marketing network existing for it to tap customer bases outside the beach resort where it is located, it does not have very strong ties. This leads to a very few tourists, from other hotels, who choose to use Hydrosports' facilities. The Entrepreneur here is utilizing the water resource in terms of the sea for the guests to increase their experience consumption. The sea being a public resource is open...
for competition, which is what happened to Hydrosports in terms of water scooters gaining popularity at a nearby attraction point (marker) called "Dona Paula". The marker element utilized by these water scooter operators was a much better known attraction as compared to the marker used by Hydrosports. The role of a marker indicates a strong influence especially where the attraction is either secondary or tertiary. In the case of the competition from the water scooters it is seen that the water scooters though tertiary in terms of their status of the nucleus attraction, could garner tourists for its rides as the marker that they used was a very strong secondary attraction having been extensively made known through popular "Hindi" cinemas as a point where movies were shot. The strength of the marker for a tertiary attraction seems to be an important factor in terms of drawing tourists towards itself. Hydrosports seems to lack this strength of the marker and hence is that much more handicapped in getting the "walk-in" tourists which tertiary attractions thrive on.
5.3 Analysis of “Paco D’Anha” Manor house.

The Quinta do Paco d’Anha belonging to the d’Agorreta d’Alpuim family is truly exquisite. The Quinta has belonged to this family since 1503 and was given to them by the 4th Duke of Braganca. It has been called “Paco D’ Anha” as the King of Portugal D. Antonio took refuge in this Manor House in 1580 A.D. Spread over more than 50 hectares, its vineyards, green parks and pristine forests are a delight to anyone interested in Nature. The Paco D’ Anha white wine (Vinho Verde) is from the vineyards here and is branded after the Manor House itself. It is bottled and packed at the Manor House itself and the wine is stored in the cellars.

This manor house is a member of TURIHAB (Association of owners of Manor Attractions in Rural areas) and is termed as a “Quinta” meaning “Garden” in Portuguese. It is classified as a Category “A” manor house under the categorization scheme of TURIHAB. Its serene surroundings are a perfect product-market fit for the markets that TURIHAB seeks to develop.

5.3(a) Analysis of Paco D’Anha from MacCannell’s framework.

This ancient Manor House has been turned into an attraction after TURIHAB helped in developing it to its present status. It is a Heritage
attraction and fits into MacCannell's framework of attraction development. The first stage of "naming" the attraction occurred when the attraction was considered worth preserving and restoring it to its former glory. The "framing and elevation" started after the intervention of TURiHAB and the attraction was thrown open for visitation. Interestingly the "enshrinement" stage of the site sacrilization process did not take place after the attraction was opened for visitation but had occurred earlier. The "marker" in this case was the fact that the former King of Portugal D. Antonio had taken refuge in this very Manor House in 1580 and hence the Manor House had become famous. It has now become a marker for the attraction. In that sense an on-site marker such as the fact mentioned above need not be necessarily after the attraction has been created / developed but may exist as a marker even before the attraction has been recognized as an attraction. It only does not exist as a marker in the "tourism" sense due to the fact that the attraction was not thrown open for visitation to the public earlier. The existence of the Manor House's brand of local White Wine (Vinho Verde) earlier than the attraction was used as a Mechanical Reproduction by Paco d'Anha for the purpose of creating awareness. The grapes used for the wine are grown in the vineyards of the Manor House. The wine is also named as "Paco D'Anha (Vinho Verde). As far as the Social Reproduction stage is concerned, it is yet to be seen in this case.
5.3(b) Analysis from Gunn's Framework.

The entire attraction being protected by a boundary wall creates a zone of closure within which the attraction opens itself to experience consumption for the guests. The Manor House being an attraction along with the farms and the vineyards exhibits a phenomenon wherein the guest has to experience the attraction by living there and hence the inviolate belt has been built into the attraction itself. The theme creation in the inviolate belt to enable the guest to interpret and experience the attraction better is consciously created by the team of architects from TURíHAB as a part of its activities. The attraction is not staged and experiences for the guests are not created / staged. On the other hand the guest is allowed to enjoy the peace and quiet of the farm along with the vineyards and wine tasting experience if the guest wishes to do so. This is certainly not seen in many attractions that are resource based. Here the resource is "Heritage" and is depicted by the old Manor House and the architecture and yet the core attraction is experienced through an inviolate belt. The restoration of the Heritage House itself is done with a view to enable the guest to experience the "Heritage" factor. As such there has been no other interpretational area / space which is evident in an inviolate belt according to Gunn. As there is no staged authenticity, the role of interpretation is left to the guest who does it according to his / her experience at the heritage house. However the owners are always
there to explain the heritage / lineage of the attraction to the guests if they wish to know. The development of the attraction itself was designed for the guests to experience the ancient / "period" life by making it available in the contemporary lifestyle of the guests. The attraction being situated in a village does not make itself amenable to the peripheral features of an attraction such as play areas, snack bars, parking lots, shopping areas, and souvenir shops etc. which depict the Zone of Closure according to Gunn. If one looks at the attraction from Gunn's point then the entire village becomes a Zone of Closure as it encompasses all the features that are associated with the Zone of Closure. The visitor's experience of the Manor House is heightened by the thematic setting of the attraction in terms of its architecture, period furniture / antiques, family heirlooms as well as the fact that the family is still residing in the very Manor House. The interaction of the visitor with the Manor House owners also increases the authentic experience of the visitors.

5.3 (c) Analysis from Leiper's framework.

Leiper's framework of analyzing attractions looks at the concept of primary, secondary and tertiary attractions, indicating the pulling capacity of the attraction at a destination. If one looks at Paco D'Anha as an attraction from Leiper's viewpoint then one can identify it as a primary attraction, though similar such attractions would also be giving
similar benefits at different places in Portugal. The product/experience that is bought at such Manor Houses is basically the peace and quiet that guests seek from tourism in rural areas. The product is very well defined in terms of experiences and matches the market perfectly. The guests come to the destination with a view to enjoy the rural life and quietitude and as such it can be designated as a primary attraction or the nucleus, though the product is in peripheral areas rather than in the honey-pot areas of tourism in Portugal such as Algarve. The market for this kind of experiences is very focused. There seem to be no linkages between the product offered by Paco D'Anha and other honey-pot areas of tourism indicating that more than one primary nucleus of attractions can exist at a destination. The interesting thing here is that the demand for these kind of attractions is essentially created by TURIHAB, a cooperative of many such attractions who come together to strengthen their marketing and bargaining base. The marketing of Paco D'Anha is done by TURIHAB and the effective marker used by Paco D'Anha is the fact that the King of Portugal had taken shelter in that very "Manor House" in the 15th century. The marker probably increases the saleability of the attraction as compared to other attractions of similar types in Portugal. One fact that emerges out of this analysis is that an attraction like Paco D'Anha has created, through the cooperative organization TURIHAB, a market (60%) for itself outside Portugal. This has created a primary market for Paco
D’Anha outside Portugal and has thus become a primary nucleus attraction to such markets. At the same time it is still considered a secondary nucleus for the Portuguese even though they happen to experience the attraction increasingly. A captive clientele from the Bank of Portugal has also helped in increasing visitation to this attraction by the Portuguese. Thus an attraction, though offering the same experience base to different guests, may not necessarily be termed “primary” or “secondary” exclusively and can exist in more than one state simultaneously. This is more so in the case of the Portuguese guests as they visit the attraction on weekends rather than for longer periods like the foreign guests. There has been an increasing awareness amongst the Portuguese of these kinds of attractions leading to their becoming a primary attraction for the weekend. It is here that one notes the difference in the approach towards the attraction of the Portuguese guests and the foreign guests. The Portuguese enjoy it as a weekend getaway whereas the foreign guests view it from the point of agro-tourism / rural tourism and for peace and quiet. The attraction did not do anything to promote any secondary attraction around it nor did any market for such attractions exist except for some forays by the guests to the beach nearby.
5.4 Analysis of Casa do Ameal.

Casa do Ameal is a beautiful Manor House classified as a “Casa Antiga” and is categorized under “B” class of Solares de Portugal. Its history dates back to the 16th Century and the Faria Araujo Family purchased it in 1669 for 3,500 shillings. The family resides there even today and four sisters of the family look after the entire management.

Casa do Ameal is one of the first heritage houses to be associated with TURIHAB.

5.4(a) Analysis using MacCannell’s framework.

The heritage house has been through the site sacrilization process described by MacCannell (1976). The naming, framing and elevation stages of this attraction were very strongly supported by TURIHAB wherein the team of architects, engineers and the history experts helped restore the past glory of Casa do Ameal. One of the interesting features of this heritage house development is that the house owners saw this as a potential for earning after their other activities like farming etc, did not give them adequate returns. As there was no passionate desire among the owners to reinstate the glory of the house for its own sake, they very readily followed TURIHAB in their quest for commercial value out of the heritage house. TURIHAB, due to its objectives of maintaining the heritage of Portugal undertook the restoration after Casa do Ameal owners joined
TURIHAB. This was a mutually beneficial decision as the heritage house would gain from TURIHAB through its marketing and other connections and TURIHAB in turn would add a valuable member to the association to further its cooperative and developmental agenda.

Mechanical reproduction of this attraction does not exist either, from TURIHAB or from the owners of the house. It is quite interesting that although there are more than 100 TURIHAB heritage houses, mechanical reproduction that can be a sort of competitive / advertising tool has not been a recourse for the owners of Casa do Ameal. This is all the more interesting as the owners were primarily interested in the commercial value of the heritage house and get close to 92% of their visitors through TURIHAB's central reservation system.

Social reproduction stage has not as yet been seen in this attraction.

5.4(b) Analysis from Gunn’s Framework.

The attraction is designed in a manner to cater to the needs of the guests who stay there. The design and the interiors are done such that the heritage factor is prominently “visible”, both, in terms of tangibility as well as in terms of “abstractness”. The guests can appreciate the grandeur of the heritage through the ancient artifacts that the family owns and which are displayed in the different rooms as well as in the common dining hall.
where traditional breakfast is served. This forms the core product that Gunn’s framework talks about. The other two levels / areas surrounding the core attraction are conspicuous by their absence in a physical sense. The guests do not have any mechanism by which they can appreciate the heritage factor other than through their own experience. There are no interpretation areas / buffer spaces that Gunn talks about in the design sense, which enable the visitor to better appreciate the attraction. The guest has to necessarily experience the attraction and interpret the attraction as well as his / her experience on his / her own. The owners do help the guests with answers to their queries regarding the history of the house as well as the history of the "period artifacts". Beyond this there is no formal structure so as to enable the guests to appreciate the heritage house better. The argument put forth by TURIHAB is that while designing the heritage house and while formulating the policies for its members the requirements of the target market were taken into consideration. As such a rule was made ensuring the owners’ compulsory stay at the heritage house during the season. One of the requirements of the target market was that they wanted peace and quiet and a rural atmosphere. The target market was not comfortable with any kind of intermediary to mediate the process of consumption of the real experience of the rural atmosphere that Turismo Espaco Rural (TER) basically wanted to promote. Hence at activity based attractions such as the “Solares de Portugal”
there cannot exist a physical setting that enables the interpretation of the attraction experience other than the design of the attraction structure where the core product is experienced.

The zone of closure also is not within the purview of the attraction as the other factors such as restaurants, parking space for the guests etc. is available within the attraction itself. The zone of closure then is the entire village surrounding the attraction.

5.4 (c) Analysis from Leiper's framework.

Analysing this attraction from Leiper's framework one can see that it depicts a secondary attraction. If one were to go by the fact that TURIHAB has created a market for this heritage house then one can see that it is a primary attraction and visitors have chosen this house primarily because they want to live in a rural atmosphere and enjoy the main benefit of the product i.e., peace and quiet in a rural setting. The attraction individually may not seem to be the primary attraction as compared to the generic attraction of rural countryside tourism. It is more of a secondary decision by the guest to choose this attraction in particular to satisfy the need for peace and quiet. In that sense it is TURIHAB that has created this primary status of the attraction called "Solares de Portugal" that has enabled the manor houses to capitalize and benefit.
The attraction is also exhibiting secondary status when one considers the domestic tourists in Portugal. These tourists come down to the manor houses only as a weekend getaway and do not consume the attraction’s intrinsic product offering.

**Conclusion.**

The analysis of the four attraction case studies is in consonance with the general theoretical frameworks but has a few deviations that have been observed in the case studies. There also seems to be a distinct pattern in the development of attractions studied above.

1. MacCannell’s (1976) framework presupposes a growth path for the attraction that is based on the attraction’s ability to draw tourists towards it and gain popularity. Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in the attraction business do not have this ability as seen from the case studies. As such they do not progress beyond the “Enshrinement” stage.

2. The concept of Mechanical Reproduction according to MacCannell (1976) is more promotion oriented. He sates “It is the Mechanical Reproduction phase that is most responsible for setting the tourist in motion on his journey to find the true object” (p.p. 45). This is under the assumption that the process of Mechanical
Reproduction is widely spread across the society where the attraction is located or even beyond the geographical location of the attraction. This aspect of Mechanical reproduction is not found in the case studies studied indicating that the process is limited to the entrepreneur and is done for promotional purposes. As the attraction is in the private domain there seems to be no public "ownership" of the mechanical reproduction process and hence society does not participate in the mechanical reproduction phase. The role of the mechanical reproduction as a promotional tool gets severely reduced due to the non-participation of society in this process. Society will probably participate when the attraction becomes very big and almost becomes synonymous with the destination area. At this juncture society would have "public ownership" of the attraction in terms of its wide acceptance and would then help in promoting the attraction by way of commercial activities that would encompass the mechanical reproduction phase.

3. Attractions in peripheral areas are either large (flagship attractions) or are owned and managed by entrepreneurs of small and medium enterprises. In order to increase the experience at the attraction for visitors the necessity of a strong inviolate belt was strongly felt in the attractions of Ancestral Goa and Hydrosports.
Theoretically the inviolate belt serves as an interpretational medium through which the visitor better appreciates the attraction. The attractions of Ancestral Goa and Hydrosports having weaker inviolate belts were at a disadvantage to increase visitation that is so much more important to the secondary and tertiary attractions at a tourist destination. These attractions exhibit an authentic experience due to an active interaction of the visitor with the attraction resource. It is because of this experiential interaction that the existence of a strong inviolate belt is necessary. Such attractions probably would benefit by creating a variety of experiential situations / offerings for the visitor in the form of a wider product portfolio and utilize the inviolate belt to enhance the experience.

4. Zone of Closure is a concept that can be associated with "static attractions", i.e., attractions where the experience is created or experienced in a given geographic location. In case of Hydrosports Ltd., all the activities are in the sea and as such the attraction is more dynamic. Even in the static attractions such as the "Solares de Portugal", the zone of closure was omitted from the design as the visitors' need was to experience rural tourism. This would mean the entire village as the zone of closure as compared to a designated space in other attractions. The existence or
absence of a zone of closure is dependent on the type of attraction and the needs of that specific market to which the attraction caters. In the case of peripheral attractions it may be prudent to allow a zone of closure to emerge rather than plan it, as this will help the developmental process of the peripheral area. Moreover it may not be necessary to have the zone of closure geographically close to the attraction in a peripheral area as is exhibited in the case of the heritage houses in Portugal.

5. Secondary and tertiary nuclei as per Leiper’s (1990) framework seem to exist in peripheral areas. Attractions in peripheral areas seldom have a primary nucleus status. As a secondary nucleus, these attractions need to have strong markers, which act as the informational component to draw visitors towards them. The development of attractions in peripheral areas necessitates this to enable them to create the pull factor that is vital for their growth. In the case studies this aspect is seen in the case of Ancestral Goa with its sculpture of “Meerabai” and with Paco D’Anha with its “abstract” marker of the refuge of king Antonio in that heritage house.
5.5 Analysis of the Case study on TURIHAB.

TURIHAB as an association of owners of "Heritage Houses" in Portugal has been effectively functioning to meet its objectives of preservation of the heritage, tradition and culture apart from providing accommodation in the rural areas of Portugal through its "Solares de Portugal" and representing the members at international events. Since its inception in 1983 it has tried to bring tourism to the rural areas of Portugal and has succeeded in terms of visitations to its Solares de Portugal.

Tourism resources are both in the private as well in the public domain which are shared by stakeholders at the destination for business purposes, as well as by the local residents for consumption purposes. The effective use of these resources is determined by, both, the private as well as public institutions. TURIHAB, though a private cooperative organization has integrated the local communities that are in the public domain to effectively enhance the resource utilization at the destination. The question is not of the initiative of the public or private investors but the efforts to coordinate to develop the region as a tourism destination. This challenge is taken up by TURIHAB, which has successfully pioneered the development of tourism in the northern part of Portugal.
Concept creation.

TURIHAB created the concept of a brand of heritage houses called "Solares de Portugal". The reason why I call it the creation of a concept of a brand is because of the fact that TURIHAB has consciously organized the development of TER (Turismo Espacio Rural). If one looks at the approach taken by TURIHAB one can see that the developmental process has involved the Government of Portugal in terms of soft funding for restructuring and renovating the Heritage houses, the local bodies such as the municipalities and local tourism boards in terms of either funding of staff or coordination in developing the region/locality or area. These efforts of coordinating with various bodies, both local government and national government have paid rich dividends to TURIHAB in terms of developing TER and bringing it to the stage that it is today in Portugal.

Jefferson and Lickorish (1991) contend that product development in tourism must be marketing oriented, since tourism is a demand or market force. They argue that the marketers can also shape development in a region by innovating and creating new services and attractions. It is this aspect that is vital for the well being of any destination. The marketers using the product development strategies that cater to specific market segments can create an image of the destination. This product-market fit enhances the potential to create strategically strong and competitive
images of the destination. A destination, based on its inventory of resources is in a position to innovate and create better and competitive stages for the tourism experiences to unfold.

The required investment is usually uncoordinated and is made in a haphazard manner, as there are conflicting interests among the players in the market including the government. Keeping in mind all this TURIHAB has very clearly laid out its goals and has gone about systematically organizing itself to take on the competition as well as the role of developing rural tourism in the peripheral areas of Portugal. It may not be wrong to state that TURIHAB is a pioneer in this field and has created a flagship attractions status for its brand "Solares de Portugal" in the peripheral areas of Portugal. This is evident from the visitation to its member houses by international tourists as well as by the Portuguese. In fact in the year 2001 a larger number of Portuguese visited the heritage houses of TURIHAB as compared to international tourist arrivals to the houses from any individual country. This indicates the preference of the Portuguese for the brand "Solares de Portugal".

TURIHAB, at a very early stage, understood the potential of a cooperative organization in tourism. They realized the immense power that a cooperative organization can have with the other players in the market, be it the government for support, the financers for finance or the tour operators when it comes to induce visitation to the "Solares". Alliances in
marketing of such attractions in a destination are not uncommon. Most alliances are usually mutually beneficial. Palmer and Bejou (1995) argue that stakeholders may perceive little potential for tourism development and therefore little benefit from investing in an alliance. In contrast the honey-pot areas may witness little need for an alliance given that there is already a mass market for the players. They further state that the motivation for creating a tourism marketing alliance is greatest when the potential for tourism development is perceived as being large and within the competitive environment. In the case of TURIHAB it was exactly the same as it envisaged the heritage attraction potential as well as the rural "quiet and peace" need of the tourists to create the brand "Solares de Portugal". The alliance, which turned into a cooperative organization, helped in not only organizing the product and creating the brand but also facilitated in the marketing of such a brand. Once the product development process was standardized through the committees of TURIHAB they turned their attention to developing the marketing network and introduced CENTER, the centralized booking for TURIHAB houses on the Internet.

The role of TURIHAB in the development of rural tourism in Portugal is quite strong. It provided the necessary platform for tourism in rural areas to grow. All this did not come without proper planning. Moutinho (1990) states that many factors contribute to the failure of small businesses,
including poor marketing execution and inconsistent service. They need to know where the opportunity exists and how to make the most out of it. It is in this area that TURIHAB first came into the picture. TURIHAB organized itself as a bargaining power with the government of Portugal to get the much-needed financial subsidies for the reconstruction of the "Heritage Houses" that belonged to the members of TURIHAB. These funds were utilized to create the product i.e., the "restored" heritage house so that it conformed to the standards set by TURIHAB. These standards were acceptable standards in the industry as is evident from the high visitation to these facilities.

A major aspect that is seen in the development of tourism destinations is the lack of initiative taken for its development in the hinterland. In many cases there is very little enthusiasm, both commercial as well as artistic, to help promote and develop tourism in the region. It is here that the leadership of TURIHAB is very well seen. It provided the necessary fillip to keep the "flock" of heritage house members together and continued to encourage the development of rural tourism. This indicates that the role of a mediator or an intervening organization is a must, especially, in the case of the development of rural / hinterland tourism. It is very interesting to see that the very weakness that is inherent in peripherally located attractions has been turned into an advantage by development of the brand "Solares de Portugal". The cost of access to the peripheral
locations being quite high TURIHAB went into the "niche-marketing" strategy and decided to have exclusively "peace and Quiet" seeking tourists as its customers. This led to the better bargaining power of TURIHAB with the tour operators for Rural/ Hinterland tourism. The planned product-market fit of TURIHAB ensured a better deal regarding prices etc. as well as a better-managed image of rural tourism.