

Key Words

collaboration, stakeholder, event management, festival, religious event, tourism

Stakeholder Collaboration for a Religious Tourism Mega Event

SURABHI GORE, MPhil, MBA, MTM

Assistant Professor
Affiliation: Rosary College of Commerce & Arts
Department of BBA Travel & Tourism, Navelim, Salcete, Goa

Abstract

The “Exposition of the relics of St Francis Xavier” is a decennial mega event held at the world heritage site of “Churches and Convents of Goa”. The paper analyses the grounds on which collaborations among the stakeholders are formed during the preparation for the event. It highlights the concerns of the stakeholders. The research also brings to light the issues that lead to conflicts among the stakeholders. The data is collected by personally interviewing the stakeholders through a structured questionnaire. The analysis is done by correlating the responses of the stakeholders with the literature on stakeholder collaboration. The results show that the stakeholders formed collaboration for event management, economic benefits, conflict management and conservation. The concerns expressed by stakeholders were with regards to collaboration, religious tourism, heritage management and event management. Private sector stakeholders have associations that assist them in resolving conflicts through negotiations, whereas among public sector stakeholders, conflicts are covert. The paper's originality lies in examining a decennial event in a unique setting and its implications on the stakeholders. The article would help the policy makers in understanding the problems and issues faced by the stakeholders while planning for tourism events.

INTRODUCTION

The “Exposition of the relics of Saint Francis Xavier” is a decennial mega event held in Goa, India wherein the revered relics of the saint are taken in a procession from Basilica of Bom Jesus (where the relics are kept at all times) to Se Cathedral for adoration. Both these churches are a part of World Heritage Site of “Churches and Convents of Goa” listed under UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). The event is attended by the faithful from the world over. The event is unique as the relics of the saint are placed for veneration for the pilgrims. Every year in December, the church celebrates the feast of the saint, but during the decennial year, the relics are venerated. The saint is said to have miraculous healing powers. Pilgrims offer wax metaphors of the body parts they want the saint to heal. The paper is based on the event held from November 22 to January 4, 2015, at Old Goa. Figure 1 shows the world heritage site of churches and convents of Goa. Figure 2 shows the picture of the procession of the relics and the relics being venerated by the pilgrims.

The stakeholders for the event are identified as primary (those who are affected directly by the activities in the tourism industry) and secondary (those who are affected indirectly by the activities in the tourism industry) (Clarkson, 1995). The Church organises the event. The state government, along with the tourism department, help the church in managing the event. The other primary stakeholders are travel agents, hotels, taxi operators, transport department and locals. Secondary stakeholders include associations like TTAG (Travel and Tourism Association of Goa), CII (Confederation of Indian Industries, Goa Chapter), GCCI (Goa Chamber of Commerce and industries) and ASI (Archaeological Society of India). For the event, each stakeholder is expected to have the foresight to communicate, cooperate and collaborate with the other stakeholders. The event of this nature requires meticulous planning in multidisciplinary areas, and so collaboration becomes integral. The primary stakeholders need to work in tandem and understand each other's concerns. They are usually more dominant than secondary stakeholders (Reid, 2011; Tiew, Holmes and De Bussy, 2015). The objectives of the study are

1. To analyse the rationale behind forming collaborations among the stakeholders, especially for a religious tourism event.

2. To find out the concerns among the stakeholders for the event and collaboration.

3. To find out the issues, if any, that leads to conflicts among the primary stakeholders.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review cited below gives a brief on the concepts of world heritage sites, stakeholder theory, collaboration theory, stakeholder collaboration, religious tourism and event tourism. The religious event organised at a world heritage site incorporates these concepts. The event also shows the traits of a tourism event, and so ideas of religious tourism and event tourism are discussed. Additionally, it gives a perspective on the research done in the area of stakeholder collaboration for planning and managing events, issues and conflicts in heritage management.

World Heritage Sites are tourism magnets and national icons. They are resources that are conserved for future generations and also made available to the people for knowledge and pleasure (ICOMOS, 1993). Many heritage sites are also religious tourism sites, and so a proper balance between the two needs to be maintained by the heritage managers. Heritage management involves conservation planning, architectural design, reconstruction techniques and more importantly, the reproduction of the past,

Figure 1. World Heritage Site of Churches and Convents of Goa



Source: Ankur and Shoma (2012)

Figure2. A) Procession of the relics B) Pilgrims kissing the relics



Source: Google Images

cross-cultural sensitivity and education (Nuryanti, 1996). Heritage managers need to deal with several issues such as conservation, commoditisation, overcrowding, experiences and interpretation. They put a greater emphasis on preservation without taking into account the site's contemporary purpose (Grimwade and Carter, 2000). Several researchers have concluded that conflicting interest in heritage management leads to tensions and conflicts between stakeholders (Cheung, 1999; Maikhuri, Nautiyal, Rao and Saxena, 2001; Jamal, 2004; Jones and Shawb, 2012; Maharjan, 2012; Nyaupane, 2009; Porter and Salazar, 2005). The conflicts are most likely to surface when the power balance between stakeholders shifts (Mckercher, 1993). Stakeholder theory focuses on identifying and involving all the stakeholders in the functioning of the organisation (Freeman, 1984). A stakeholder in the tourism sector is believed to be anyone who is affected by development positively or negatively. Stakeholder relationships work on three levels of analysis, the, i.e. organisation as a whole, standard operating procedures and day to day activities (Freeman, 2004). Venkataraman (2002) states that if the stakeholder interests are not in tandem with the collaboration, the collaboration collapses and a new partnership will be created. A number of studies have used stakeholder theory to examine policies and strategies formed during events, roles of

stakeholders and stakeholder management (Long, 2000; Larson and Wikstrom, 2001; Larson, 2002; Getz, Anderson, Larson, 2007; Parent and Sequin, 2007; Yasarata, Altinay, Burns and Okumus, 2010; Tkaczynski, 2013; Ziakas, 2013; Phi, Dredge and Whitford, 2014; Pappas, 2014). Collaboration theory stresses on making decisions that are mutually agreeable by all stakeholders (Gray, 1989). Jamal and Getz (1995) defined stakeholder collaboration as “a process of joint decision making among key stakeholders to resolve planning problems of the destination”. They proposed that “Collaboration should be based on the understanding that decisions taken would be followed”. The collaboration's authenticity and control come from the incorporation of the primary stakeholders, external consent, and the presence of ample resources to carry out the process and realise outcomes. Most collaborations are inter-organisational, where organisational goals are pursued by working with other organisations. For religious events, collaboration is interpersonal, intergroup and inter-organisational (Adongo and Kim, 2018). Inter-organisational relationships emerge because organisations or groups need each other (Barringer and Harrison, 2000). Stakeholder collaborations are vital for the tourism industry as it involves multidisciplinary areas. Stakeholder collaboration in the field of tourism may include different aspects of tourism

management, namely planning, organising, decision making, directing, controlling and conflict management. Jha and Mishra (2014) suggested integrative and participative tourism planning for sustainable tourism development. They examined the links between tourists, locals, market and external environment. Collaboration evades the cost of resolving conflicts in the long run (Yuksel, Bramwell and Yuksel, 1999). Sharing can result in a reduction in expenditure (Bramwell and Sharman, 1999; Bramwell and Lane, 1999; Healey, 1997). It uses local knowledge to ensure that decisions are up to date and apt (Bramwell and Sharman, 1999). It results in value creation for the stakeholders by fostering on accumulating awareness of stakeholders (Bramwell and Lane, 1999; Gray 1989; Healey, 1997) and gives the stakeholders the right to be heard. Tourism projects become transparent by involving the local community. Reciprocal participation can deliver cost-effective solutions by merging resources (Bramwell and Lane, 1999; Brohman, 1996; Healey, 1997). Yaghmour and Scott (2009) research showed positive outcomes from the collaboration between organisations for Jeddah festival in Saudi Arabia. Larson and Wikstrom (2001) researched on power and inter-stakeholder dynamics at festivals. The study found that the project networks are predominantly based on either a consensus or a conflict perspective. Getz, Anderson and Larson (2007) used case studies in Canada and Sweden to identify the primary stakeholders and their collaborations. Crespi-Vallbona and Richards (2007) researched on the perceptions of stakeholders in Spain. Stokes (2008) addressed the stakeholder orientation of event tourism strategy makers in Australia, and Johnson, Glover and Yuen (2009) focused on the role of community representatives in creating the event in Canada. The barriers of local participation in tourism development at Chilka Lake were found to be collaboration,

infrastructure and funding. (Khuntia and Mishra, 2016)

Events act as a catalyst to build local communities, mount development and structure national identities. Event planning, expansion and promotion is an unexplored area of research (Bramwell, 1997; Gnoth and Anwar, 2000; Highman, 2005) that involves organisations, stakeholders and collaborations to work together in the formulation of objectives, policies and strategies. Janiskee (1980) defined festivals and events associated with festivals as a time for gratifying deeds, leisure, and openly rejoicing the experience. Falassi (1987) stated that festivals rejuvenate the existence of the local community and endorse religious institutions. Schuster (2001) stressed the economic benefits of events. He has also said that thriving events are those that are entrenched in particular destinations and are of interest to local communities. Cerutti and Piva (2015) investigated the role of religious events in local tourism development. From the event tourism literature (Getz, 2002; Getz et al, 2007; Parent and Deephouse, 2007; Andersson and Getz, 2008; Getz and Andersson, 2010; Reid, 2011; Xue and Mason, 2011; Getz and Page, 2016) it is apparent that tourism events requires input and collaboration from numerous actors and stakeholders. Raj, Walters and Rashid (2017) concluded that the larger the event, the more intentions it will have to achieve results for its stakeholders. Event managers have made attempts to find appropriate collaboration mechanisms for resolving uneasy relationships between stakeholders (Aas, Ladkin and Fletcher, 2005; Jamal, 2004; Jamal, Stein and Harper, 2002; Jamal and Tanase, 2005; Tucker and Emge, 2010). It is argued that the dynamic characteristics of collaboration can turn its advantages into conflict over time (Lee, Riley and Hampton, 2010). Li, Wu and Cai (2008) and Su and Wall (2011) researched on heritage and tourism conflicts at world heritage sites in China. Zhang,

Fyallb and Zheng (2015) in their research on world heritage sites in China, concluded that the causes of conflicts relate to problems of management structure, tourism operations, and the deficiencies of legislation. Getz (2008) reviewed literature in event tourism and suggested analysing stakeholder strategies for managing events. The author reviewed the literature on festivals and events concerning the communities and stakeholder relationships (Getz, 2010). Korstanje (2009) compared ancient leisure events to Olympics games in Rome and concluded that both share similar characteristics.

There is substantial research on stakeholder collaboration within the context of an organisation or a destination (Marzano and Scott, 2009; Beritelli and Laesser, 2011; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2012) but, there is a dearth of research in analysing event stakeholders. Few recent studies on in this theme are from Tiew et al., 2015; Todd, Leask and Ensor, 2017. The literature highlights the importance of stakeholder participation in organising an event. The event at Goa displays the characteristics of a mega event. Though religious, it also possesses the traits of a tourism event. The paper attempts to analyse the foundation on which collaborations among the stakeholders are formed during the preparation for the event. It aims to list the concerns of the stakeholders and analyses the issues that lead to conflict. Though stakeholder collaboration is a highly discussed topic, it is not analysed concerning a religious event, set in the state of Goa.

METHODOLOGY

The initial identification of the stakeholders was made using secondary data like newspapers, magazines and travel brochures. The stakeholders were classified as primary (the stakeholders that are directly affected by the activities in the tourism industry) and secondary (the stakeholders that are indirectly affected by the activities in the tourism industry)

(Clarkson, 1995). For analysing the rationale behind forming collaborations among the stakeholders, an open-ended questionnaire was prepared. Snowball sampling method was used to recognise other probable stakeholders (at the time of personal interview). This method entails identifying stakeholders who would then be asked to suggest other stakeholders they consider vital (Finn, 1996). The questionnaire was prepared in four sections for collaboration, conflicts, event management and locals. It was prepared to conduct personal interviews so that the pattern of interviews remains unchanged. Twenty-four primary and five secondary stakeholders representing both public sector and private sectors stakeholders were interviewed personally. Each interview lasted for forty-five minutes to an hour. The questionnaire was pre-tested by first conducting interviews with secondary stakeholders. A pre-test was conducted to determine whether the interviewee understands the questions and answers provide the information required. After analysing the results of the pre-test, the questionnaire was modified. The data was recorded in the questionnaire form simultaneously. The stakeholders were asked questions about their willingness to form collaborations on various parameters like event management, benefits, conflict management, heritage management and conservation. They were also asked to list their concerns for such collaborations and in general, for the event. Further, they were asked to list their issues with other stakeholders. The analysis is done by relating the results of the study to the concepts discussed in the literature review. In the result and discussion section, first, the purpose of forming collaborations amongst the stakeholders is discussed. Then, stakeholder concerns and conflicts are listed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Gunn (1988), in his book on tourism planning, specifies that many national

governments participating in tourism are now collaborating with different stakeholders for increased teamwork and association. The organisers of the events are located in a central position in the festival network (Wasserman and Faust, 1994; Provan, Nakama, Veazie, Tuefel-Shone and Huddleston, 2003; Getz et al., 2007). For the event as well, there are specific collaborations formed. The primary reason for such collaboration was the nature of the event itself. The owner of the event was the church; the organising was the responsibility of the church and state and central government. Since the event was

organised at the world heritage site, ASI was involved for restoration, beautification and for providing control measures. Private sector operators like the travel agents, tour operators, hoteliers provided services as and when required but did not play any part in the planning process. Several NGO's (Non-Governmental Organizations) related to tourism also took a keen interest in the planning but were not included in any collaborations. With regards to the role of the stakeholders, Father Alfred Vaz (Convener of the Church Committee and Parish priest of St Cathedral) said that "*The roles for the main stakeholders are defined. Each stakeholder is expected to play their*

Table 1: Purpose and types of collaboration

Collaboration Purposes			
Event Management	Economic Benefit	Conflict Management	Conservation
Public sector collaboration between the Government, Church and ASI. Internal committees within government and church.	Instant collaborations between private sector within and outside India. (hotels, travel agents, tour operators) Permanent collaboration is not specific to the event.	No public sector collaboration Private sector collaboration is permanent collaborations not specific to the event.	Church with ASI NGO's

Source: Fieldwork

PURPOSE OF FORMING COLLABORATION

Collaboration for Event Management

Public Sector Collaboration: The collaboration was primarily of the stakeholders from the public sector like the church, government and ASI. Since the event is a highly prestigious decennial event, the primary stakeholders were leaving no stone unturned to make the event a success. The three different committees formed were between the government bodies, church and ASI. The development of infrastructure, visitation of tourists, accommodation facilities, food facilities, parking, transport, security and

marketing were under the purview of the government. The church was responsible for the religious activities at the site like taking care of the relics, organising a mass, exhibitions on the life of St Francis Xavier. The ASI took care of the conservation part of the monuments and saw that no rules and regulations were violated. The government and the church also had their internal committees looking after specific jobs. The government committee formed included different bodies like the Village Panchayat, Public Works Department (PWD), GSIDC (Goa State Infrastructure Development Corporation), police, Members of Legislative Assembly (MLA's),

Member of Parliament(MP's) and the locals. The church's committee comprised of locals and priests belonging to different parishes in Goa. *"The government has been cooperative so far, and we are confident about the infrastructural needs,"* said Fr Alfred Vaz, when asked about the committee's performance. Evan and Freeman (1988) stated that stakeholders should take an active part in the decision-making process of the firm in which the stakeholders have a stake. It is worthy to note that though there were collaborations, the decision making rested entirely with the church and the government. The private sector was not involved in any collaboration with the public sector. One of the order form, from the government published in a local daily read, *"All financial and administrative powers relating to execution of any work/infrastructure facilities shall vest with the chairman of the exposition secretariat (Government Committee) and any decision in this respect shall be final,"* (OHeraldo, 2014).

Collaboration for Economic Benefit

Financial benefits are the most common benefits derived from any event (Raj and Musgrave 2009). However, since this event was religious, the primary stakeholder, i.e. the church and the government were not looking for any economic benefits. It is inevitable that the government will benefit from the money collected as tax. The other stakeholders, like the hoteliers, travel agents and tour operators were collaborating to make maximum profits. There were no formal collaborations formed. The private sector actors on their own were collaborating with different agents within India and internationally to get maximum tourists. Some of these collaborations were permanent collaborations, not specific to the event.

Collaboration for Conflict Management

Public Sector Collaboration: Though there

were some underlying conflicts in the committees with regards to the day to day working of the event, none of the stakeholders wanted to address the issues. There was no collaboration formed to take care of conflicts. The conflicts were overlooked and never discussed. The Sarpanch of Old Goa, Mr Prasad Amonker, when asked about the role of Panchayat, said, *"If anything goes wrong during the exposition the whole blame will come on the panchayat"*.

Private Sector Collaboration: The stakeholder collaborations for the private sector organisations for managing conflict were in the form of three associations TTAG (Travel & Tourism Association of Goa), CII (Confederation of Indian Industries), GCCI (Goa Chamber of Commerce and Industries). These organisations work as a link between the members and the government. These bodies help their members by putting forth their issues with the government and by helping the members to find possible solutions. The TTAG is an association of representatives of hotels, travel agencies and tour operators in Goa. It is a non-profit, non-governmental organisation committed to fostering the foundation of sound and constructive tourism in Goa. The CII acts as a "centre of excellence" and provides on-demand training and also coordinates with the government on investment and infrastructure issues. One of the targets for CII is to reduce the skill gap in Goa for the tourism industry. Goa Chamber of Commerce & Industry (GCCCI) is Goa's leading non-profit business organisation, providing support services to business organisations in Goa. With regards to the event, there were no collaborations. However, any issues that the stakeholders had with regards to the event were addressed by these organisations.

Collaboration for Conservation

Teamwork and alliances are significant

issues in the planning process for tourism. They are believed to be contributing to sustainable tourism development (Bramwell and Lane, 1999; Hall, 2008; Selin, 1999) by involving local communities through the incorporation of ideas (Mitchell and Reid, 2001; Tosun, 2000). The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) is the organisation that looks after the conservation/restoration/renovation needs of all heritage sites and monuments in India. ASI is also the body which is responsible for research work in this area. For the event, ASI collaborated with the church on all the restoration work. The ASI regularly inspects the monuments for any visual signs of degradation and after approval from its director carries out the work. The officials of ASI thought that they should collaborate with institutions like the National Institute of Oceanography or Goa University to gain insights into research. However, for the event, no such collaboration existed. The other Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) like Centre for responsible tourism, Charles Correa Foundation, Goa Heritage Action Group, Save Old Goa Action Group collaborates from time to time depending

on the issue at hand. For the event, they were collaborating among themselves to plead to the government to include them in the managing committees. They were also working together and keeping a close eye on the developments that were happening at the site to see to it that no rules and regulations were broken. Several articles on the local dailies highlighted the viewpoints of such groups, but the organising committees did not give any consideration to them.

Pearce (2001), in his discovery, asserted that local tourism policy is a result of “a happy juxtaposition of the right people and the right skills”. Tourism planners need to establish a universal position between the different stakeholders of tourism with regards to heritage management so that it remains mutually beneficial to all stakeholders (Aas et al., 2005). In the case of the event, not including the NGO's was a deviation from the literature.

STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS

The major themes that emerge from the literature for stakeholder concerns are about collaboration, religious tourism, heritage management and event management. Table 2 summarises the concerns of the stakeholders.

Table 2: Stakeholder Concerns

Collaboration	Heritage Management	Religious Tourism	Event Management
Benefits are not shared with all the stakeholders.	Safety	Religious Sanctity	Traffic Management
Decision making rests with the primary stakeholders.	Overexposure at the site	Tourist Education and behaviour	Crowd Management
Undercutting of Prices	Land use and garbage management	Dress Code	Taxi Mafia
	Following rules and regulations	Creating Religious Aura	IFFI (International Film Festival of India)

Source: Fieldwork

Concerns for Collaboration

Sharing Economic Benefits: According to collaboration theory, the benefits of the collaboration should be shared by all the stakeholders of the collaboration equally. The private sector stakeholders were reluctant to get into any collaboration as they felt that the benefits would go to prominent stakeholders.

Decision Making: In the collaborations formed, all the decisions were taken by the primary stakeholders, i.e. the church and the government. The NGO's who wanted to get involved in the planning were not incorporated in the committees. Research states that collaboration improves the quality of decisions as diverse views are considered (Duarte, 2016; Gray, 1989; Nuhoff-Isakhanyan, Wubben and Omta, 2016), but in this case, the stakeholders were barred from playing an active role in decision making.

Undercutting Prices: Many travel agents, tour operators, hotels and restaurants in order to cash in indulge in undercutting on prices. As a result, other honest operators suffer. Also, the government is robbed of substantial tax benefits. There were no measures taken to keep a check on this. One of the travel agent during the interview said that *“Undercutting of prices is a huge problem in Goa. The government should have standard pricing policies for transport and hotel and taxi bookings.”*

Concerns for Heritage Management

Tourism planners need to establish a universal position between the different stakeholders of tourism with regards to heritage management so that it remains mutually beneficial to all stakeholders (Aas et al., 2005). The stakeholders were concerned about the safety of the tourist and the monuments. With regards to overexposure, the stakeholders believed that it would not cause any problems. The sarpanch of the village panchayat of Old

Goa Mr Prasad Amonkar said that *“The exposition would cause superficial damage in terms of garbage and land use management and stressed that they could be easily rectified once the event was over.”* The stakeholders were also concerned about rules and regulations being followed by the pilgrims.

Concerns for Religious Tourism

Maintaining religious sanctity of the monument was found to be a significant concern. Educating the tourist about the importance of the monuments, dress code, the behaviour of children were some of the concerns addressed. Father Allan, a priest, suggested that *“Religious aura can be created around the site by playing Georgian and Polyphonic music, similar to some European countries to maintain high religious sanctity.”*

Event Management

The stakeholders had concerns regarding crowd management and traffic management. Though many volunteers would be on duty managing the traffic, the stakeholders were apprehensive as the event would go on for one and a half month. Managing the taxi mafia is another primary concern of the stakeholders. Another international event, IFFI (International Film Festival of India) would also happen at the same time in Goa, and so the stakeholders were worried about the distribution of resources among delegates and pilgrims. The church expressed its concern regarding the pilgrims becoming soft targets. Father Alfred pointed out that *“Last year NSG (National Security Guard) commandos had visited the churches to assess the area concerning security.”*

STAKEHOLDER CONFLICTS

Gray (1989) defined collaboration as a practice of cooperative resolution among essential stakeholders of a destination about the prospects of that destination. He asserted that collaboration could be

effectively used to subdue conflict and move forward with mutual ideas, where stakeholders identify the probable rewards of functioning together. Also, many other authors justified that collaboration can help reduce conflicts. Yuksel et al. (1999) stated that coordination and collaboration help to evade the cost of mediating conflicts at all times. Though the above author's theories stand true for the private

sector where organisations like TTAG, CII and GCCI are formed to resolve conflicts amongst the stakeholders or between the stakeholders and the government, the conflicts between the actors of the public sector were not discussed in the open. Table 3 depicts the conflicts between the primary, secondary sector stakeholders.

Table: 3 Major Conflicts

Archaeological Society of India	Church
	Government of Goa
	Public Works Department
Government of Goa	Conservationists
	Locals

Source: Fieldwork

Archaeological Society of India and Church

ASI and the church do not see eye to eye on the following issues.

- Fire hazard due to cooking being done at the church: The church authorities were planning to provide basic food to the pilgrims at the site. The ASI officials were not very happy with this arrangement as cooking may be hazardous.
- Church grounds being used for playing football by the priests: The parishioners are often found playing football in the grounds of the church which is against the regulations listed by UNESCO for protecting the monument.
- Use of electric bulbs instead of candles at the altar: Earlier times candles were lit at the altar which is now replaced by light bulbs. The priest at the church said that *“The candles were challenging to maintain”*, but ASI officials do not agree and feel that light bulbs may fade the altar paintings.
- The church paintings taken for restoration are never returned: The ASI regularly takes out paintings from the

church for restoration. The ASI official said that *“Some of these paintings are sent out of Goa. Many times they take a very long time to come back”*. The church then accuses the ASI of robbing the painting.

- Monuments referred to as heritage sites and not religious properties: The ASI sees the church monuments as any other historical site, but the priests believe that the monuments are very much alive as prayers and masses are held in both the churches, The Basilica as well as Se' Cathedral every day. Father Allan conveyed his displeasure by saying that *“The ASI looks at the churches as any heritage monument and calls it a “dead monument” without understanding its religious significance.*

The issues listed above were never discussed in public by any of the stakeholders, neither the church authorities nor the ASI. Stakeholders preferred to remain silent to avoid verbal conflicts. These problems can only be solved when both the stakeholders decide to discuss and negotiate matters.

Archaeological Society of India and Government of Goa

The event site is a UNESCO world heritage site. The regulations given by UNESCO have to be administered by the government, i.e. one hundred meters of the area around the site is a restricted area where only repair/restoration work is allowed, and no new construction can be done. Up till 200m is the regulated area where construction can take place with a NOC from the National Monuments Authority, New Delhi. The ASI officials did not have any information on permission taken by the government officials for constructing toilets and widening the roads by cutting forests. As a corrective measure, the ASI officials issue notices for any activity taking place without proper permission, but their notices are

often ignored. They believed that independent site managers should be appointed to take care of issues at hand and should have the power to take action.

Archaeological Society of India and Public Works Department

The ASI officials think that due to rampant corruption in PWD all rules and regulations regarding vendor management and shop allocation are not followed despite several warnings. The PWD had started construction of a boundary wall on one side of the church near another historical monument "The Arch of Viceroy". After many complaints, the boundary wall was finally razed. Figure 3 shows an article in the locals daily where the PWD has agreed to remove the illegal wall built near the UNESCO site.

Figure 3: An article in the local daily



Source: Times News Network (2014)

Government of Goa and Conservationists

The heritage lovers were opposing the construction near the event site as per the UNESCO rules. The government declared that the constructions were only temporary; they would be dismantled once the event is over and the material would be used elsewhere. The conservationists argue that the guardians of conservation and restoration of the churches are themselves not aware of the quality of conservation. They say the research in the area is lacking. The members said that they have written

many times to the authorities about the problems faced by them but till date no action has been taken. World heritage sites are resources that must be managed in such a way that they are conserved for future generations and also made available to the public for its learning and gratification. It is a challenging task for the World Heritage Site managers to find equilibrium between the two demands (ICOMOS, 1993). Figure 4 shows a newspaper article showing opposition by heritage lovers over construction near the site.

Figure 4: An article showing opposition by heritage lovers over construction near the site.



Source: Fernandes, 2014

Government of Goa and the Locals

Hall and McArthur (1998) have stated that managers must include the local community in the process of planning so that the plans are superior and diminish the chances of any conflict that may arise. Managers must also ensure that formulated plans are implemented by educating the local community and making them aware of the importance of heritage. The locals believed that many times, their interests were ignored by the government. Many locals wanted to set up shops around the site but felt that the government and the local bodies were not doing anything for their interest. The locals also felt that conservation should not harm the original value of the site. Trained and qualified people should be employed for conservation aspects. Munanura and Backman (2012), in their research on stakeholder collaboration for developing countries, proposed a process model. The model involves identifying stakeholders, assigning them specific roles, developing a collaboration framework for the participation of all stakeholders. The deliberations and feedback mechanism will be able to take care of any stakeholder issues. However, Clarke and Raffay (2015) stressed that stakeholder mapping results in static representations of the stakeholders.

Collaboration may involve mediation from a third party (Moore, 2014). Stakeholders

may defy the authority of other stakeholders, but a mediator almost always has a high authenticity (Huybrechts and Nicholls, 2013; Larson, Getz and Patras, 2015). The success of stakeholder collaboration is dependent on their salience in a collaboration process (Kennedy and Augustyn, 2014; Sheehan and Ritchie, 2005). Identifying stakeholder salience helps effective stakeholder coordination, inclusion or exclusion of stakeholders in cooperative actions, and categorisation of their roles in specific projects (Boatright, 2002; Jamal and Getz, 2000). In the case of the event, negotiation and mediation are required to handle the inherent conflicts present.

CONCLUSIONS

An event requires meticulous planning and logistics support. Managing all aspects of the events is as important as the event itself. Stakeholders having expertise in different areas with regards to tourism, infrastructure, transport and accommodation were involved in making the event a success. A religious event involves not only managing the event with stakeholder collaboration; it also involves the sentiments of people. The event of this magnitude is considered to be an opportunity to create a powerful impact on both pilgrims and tourists. The main reasons for forming collaborations for the event were for event management, economic benefit, conflict management and

conservation. The main stakeholders, i.e. the government and the church formed collaboration for managing the event. All the stakeholders of the event derived benefits. The motive of the church was to make sure that the religious event's schedule is followed and maximum pilgrims venerate the relics. The government was concerned about the destination's image and the public sector bodies united to earn profits. Any conflicts between the private sector stakeholders were managed through various bodies like CII, GCCI, and TTAG. With regards to conservation, the ASI guards all the monuments against any dilapidation. It could also be relevant to note that the event by itself is a temporary phenomenon. As such, the role of long-term relationships, which otherwise are central to any stakeholder collaboration is minimum in such cases. The awareness among the stakeholder of the temporary nature of the relationships may also be a deterrent in the formation of stronger collaborations. The concept of collaboration is extensively used in value chain partnerships. In case of an event, the temporary nature may induce inclination among the stakeholders to try to obtain maximum advantage instead of a negotiating behaviour necessary in collaborations.

The concerns that the stakeholders had were with regards to the collaboration, heritage management, religious tourism and event management. For collaboration, decision making, benefit sharing and undercutting of prices were the primary concerns. Land use and garbage management, overexposure, safety were some of the issues under heritage management. In the case of religious tourism, the stakeholders were worried about creating religious sanctity, educating tourist, dress code and maintaining a spiritual aura. Managing two events, traffic management, crowd management and sharing of resources were concern regarding event management. The impact of the collaboration on conflicts related to

conservation and heritage management is not overt. On the surface, none of the stakeholders are complaining but further delved come up with issues that need to be solved. Heritage groups regularly complain in the local newspapers rather than directly collaborating with agencies. Negotiation and mediation can be used to avoid any conflicts.

The initiative to form collaborations should come from each stakeholder. There should be collaborations between the public sector and the private sector. Academic collaborations between the ASI, tourism department, university and private sector should be initiated. The government should include the participation of cultural and heritage bodies in the committees made for decision making. They are also the stakeholder of tourism and must not be ignored. Lack of communication between the stakeholders has led to conflicts. Priorities should be appropriately communicated to all stakeholders. They should be encouraged to debate about issues and arrive at amicable solutions. The parameters that make this study unique do not allow it to be compared to any other study. Nonetheless, similar events like Ardh Kumbh / Maha Kumbh Mela or Hajj can be analysed to draw generalisations.

The research gives a complete understanding of the role of stakeholders at a religious tourism event. It provides insights on the nature of stakeholder's decision-making process and their motivations to participate in a local religious event. The analysis of the stakeholders for the event gives a view of the social and institutional landscape of tourism in Goa. The research helps the policy makers in understanding the problems and issues faced by the stakeholders while planning for tourism events. Academicians can replicate the research at other religious tourism events to draw generalisations.

REFERENCES

- Aas, C., Ladkin, A. and Fletcher, J., (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of tourism research*, 32(1), pp.28-48.
- Adongo, R. and Kim, S., (2018). The ties that bind: stakeholder collaboration and networking in local festivals. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(6), pp.2458-2480.
- Andersson, T.D. and Getz, D., (2009). Tourism as a mixed industry: Differences between private, public and not-for-profit festivals. *Tourism Management*, 30(6), pp.847-856.
- Ankur and Shoma. (2012). Churches in Goa. Retrieved from <http://thetravellerware.blogspot.com/2012/10/churches-in-go.html>
- Barringer, B.R. and Harrison, J.S., (2000). Walking a tightrope: Creating value through interorganizational relationships. *Journal of management*, 26(3), pp.367-403.
- Beritelli, P. and Laesser, C., (2011). Power dimensions and influence reputation in tourist destinations: Empirical evidence from a network of actors and stakeholders. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), pp.1299-1309.
- Boatright, J.R., (2002). Contractors as stakeholders: Reconciling stakeholder theory with the nexus-of-contracts firm. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 26(9), pp.1837-1852.
- Bramwell, B., 1997. A sport mega-event as a sustainable tourism development strategy. *Tourism recreation research*, 22(2): 13-19.
- Bramwell, B., and Lane, B., (1999). Collaboration and partnerships for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3-4), 179-181.
- Bramwell, B., and Sharman, A., (1999). Collaboration in local tourism policymaking. *Annals of tourism research*, 26(2): 392-415.
- Brohman, J., (1996). New directions in tourism for third world development. *Annals of tourism research*, 23(1): 48-70.
- Cerutti, S., and Piva, E., (2015). Religious tourism and event management: An opportunity for local tourism development. *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage*, 3(1), 8-16.
- Cheung, S. C. H., (1999). The meanings of a heritage trail in Hong Kong. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 570-588.
- Clarke, A. and Raffay, Á., (2015). Stakeholders and co-creation in religious tourism and pilgrimage. *Religious tourism and pilgrimage management: an international perspective*, (Ed. 2), pp.160-172.
- Clarkson, M. E., (1995). A stakeholder framework for analysing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of management review*, 20(1), 92-117.
- Crespi-Vallbona. M., and Richards, G., (2007). The meaning of cultural festivals: Stakeholder perspectives in Catalunya. *International journal of cultural policy*, 13(1), 103-122.
- Duarte Alonso, A., (2016), July. Stakeholders, collaboration, food, and wine: The case of Jumilla's Gastronomic Days. In *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, Routledge. Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 173-191.
- Evan, W. M., and Freeman, R. E., (1988). *A stakeholder theory of the modern corporation: Kantian capitalism*.
- Falassi, A., 1987. Festival: Definition and morphology. *Time out of Time: Essays on the Festival*, 1-10
- Fernandes, P., (2014). Heritage lovers oppose construction near viceroy's arch. *The Times of India: Times-News network*. Retrieved from <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/goa/Heritage-lovers-oppose-construction-near-Viceroy-s-Arch/articleshow/44428540.cms>
- Finn, C.B., (1996). Utilising stakeholder strategies for positive collaborative outcomes. In C. Huxham(ed) *Creating Collaborative Advantage* (pp. 152-164). London: Sage
- Freeman, R. E., (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Freeman, R. E., (2004). The stakeholder approach revisited. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts-und Unternehmensethik*, 5(3), 228-254.
- Getz, D., (2002). Why festivals fail. *Event management*, 7(4), 209-219.
- Getz, D., (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, 29(3), pp.403-428.
- Getz, D., (2010). The nature and scope of festival studies. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 5(1), 1-47.

- Getz, D., and Andersson, T., 2010. Festival stakeholders: Exploring relationships and dependency through a four-country comparison. *Journal of hospitality & tourism research*, 34(4), 531-556.
- Getz, D., Andersson, T., and Larson, M., 2007. Festival stakeholder roles: Concepts and case studies. *Event Management*, 10 (2/3), 103-122.
- Getz, D., and Page, S. J., 2016. Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 52, 593-631.
- Gnoth, J., and Anwar, S. A., 2000. New Zealand bets on event tourism. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(4): 72-83.
- Gray, B., 1989. Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Grimwade, G., and Carter, B., 2000. Managing small heritage sites with interpretation and community involvement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 6(1): 33-48.
- Gunn 2nd, C. A., 1988. *Tourism Planning*, 2nd ed, Taylor and Francis. New York.
- Hall, C. M., 2008. *Tourism planning: policies, processes and relationships*. Pearson Education.
- Hall, C., and MacArthur, S., 1998. *Integrated Heritage Management*.
- Healey, P., 1997. *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Higham, J. E. (Ed.), 2005. *Sport tourism destinations: Issues, opportunities and analysis*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Huybrechts, B. and Nicholls, A., 2013. The role of legitimacy in social enterprise-corporate collaboration. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 9(2), pp.130-146.
- ICOMOS, C., 1993. *Tourism at world heritage cultural sites: the site manager's handbook*. Colombo: International Scientific Committee.
- Jamal, T., 2004. Conflict in natural area destinations: A critique of representation and 'interest' in participatory processes. *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 6(3), 352-379.
- Jamal, T. B., and Getz, D., 1995. Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of tourism research*, 22(1), 186-204.
- Jamal, T. and Getz, D., 2000. Community roundtables for tourism-related conflicts: The dialectics of consensus and process structures. *Tourism collaboration and partnerships: Politics, practice and sustainability*, 2, p.159.
- Jamal, T. B., Stein, S. M., & Harper, T. L., 2002. Beyond labels: Pragmatic planning in multistakeholder tourism-environmental conflicts. *Journal of planning education and research*, 22(2), 164-177.
- Jamal, T., and Tanase, A., 2005. Impacts and conflicts surrounding Dracula Park, Romania: The role of sustainable tourism principles. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13(5), 440-455.
- Janiskee, B., 1980. South Carolina's harvest festivals: Rural delights for day tripping urbanites. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 1(1): 96-104.
- Jha, A. K., & Mishra, J. M., 2014. Integrated and Participatory Approach to Sustainable Tourism Development: A Conceptual Study. *Journal of Tourism*, 15.
- Johnson, A. J., Glover, T. D., and Yuen, F. C., 2009. Supporting effective community representation: Lessons from the Festival of Neighbourhoods. *Managing Leisure*, 14(1), 1-16.
- Jones, R., & Shawb, B., 2012. Thinking locally, acting globally? Stakeholder conflicts over UNESCO World Heritage inscription in Western Australia. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 7(1), 839-6.
- Kennedy, V. and Augustyn, M.M., 2014. Stakeholder power and engagement in an English seaside context: implications for destination leadership. *Tourism Review*, 69(3), pp.187-201.
- Khuntia, N. and Mishra, J.M., (2016). The Barriers of Community Participation in Tourism Development in Chilika Lake, Odisha India. *Journal of Tourism*, 17(2), 83.
- Korstanje, M.E., 2009. Reconsidering the roots of event management: leisure in ancient Rome. *Event Management*, 13(3), pp.197-203.
- Larson, M., 2002. A political approach to relationship marketing: Case study of the

- Storsjöyan Festival. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4 (2), 119-143.
- Larson, M., and Wikstrom, E., 2001. Organising events: Managing conflict and consensus in a political market square. *Event Management*, 7 (1), 51-65.
- Larson, M., Getz, D. and Pastras, P., 2015. The legitimacy of festivals and their stakeholders: Concepts and propositions. *Event Management*, 19(2), pp.159-174.
- Lee, T. J., Riley, M., and Hampton, M. P., 2010. Conflict and progress: Tourism development in Korea. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(2), 355-376.
- Li, M., Wu, B., & Cai, L., 2008. Tourism development of World Heritage Sites in China: A geographic perspective. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 308-319.
- Long, P., 2000. After the event: Perspectives on organisational partnership in the management of a themed festival year. *Event Management*, 6 (1), 45-59.
- Maharjan, M., 2012. Conflict in world heritage sites of Kathmandu Valley: A case study on the conservation of private house in three durbar squares. *Nepal Tourism and Development Review*, 2(1), 87-104.
- Maikhuri, R. K., Nautiyal, S., Rao, K. S., & Saxena, K. G., 2001. Conservation policy people conflicts: A case study from Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve (a world heritage site), India. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 2(34), 355-365.
- Marzano, G., & Scott, N., 2009. Power in destination branding. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 247-267.
- Mckercher, B., 1993. Some fundamental truths about tourism: Understanding tourism's social and environmental impacts. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(1), 6-16.
- Mitchell, R. E., and Reid, D. G., 2001. Community integration: Island tourism in Peru. *Annals of tourism research*, 28(1), 113-139.
- Moore, C.W., 2014. *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Munanura, I. E., and Backman, K. F. 2012. Stakeholder Collaboration as a Tool for Tourism Planning-A Developing Country's Perspective. *Journal of Tourism*, 13(1).
- Nuhoff-Isakhanyan, G., Wubben, E. and Omta, S.W.F., 2016. Sustainability benefits and challenges of inter-organisational collaboration in Bio-Based business: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability*, 8(4), p.307.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H., 2012. Power, trust, social exchange and community support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 997-1023.
- Nuryanti, W., 1996. Heritage and Postmodern Tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 23(2): 249-260.
- Nyaupane, G. P., 2009. Heritage complexity and tourism: The case of Lumbini, Nepal. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 4(2), 157-172.
- Pappas, N., 2014. Hosting mega-events: Londoners' support of the 2012 Olympics. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 21, 10-17.
- Parent, M. M., and Deephouse, D. L., 2007. A case study of stakeholder identification and prioritisation by managers. *Journal of business ethics*, 75(1), 1-23.
- Parent, M. M., and Séguin, B., 2007. Factors that led to the drowning of a world championship organising committee: A stakeholder approach. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7(2), 187-212.
- Parrikar heads high-level panel on Exposition, 2014. oHeraldo, Retrieved from <https://www.heraldgoa.in/Goa/Parrikar-heads-highlevel-panel-on-Exposition-75417.html>
- Pearce, D., 2001. Tourism trams and local government Policymaking in Christchurch, New Zealand. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(2-4), 331-354.
- Phi, G., Dredge, D., and Whitford, M., 2014. Understanding conflicting perspectives in event planning and management using the Q method. *Tourism Management*, 40, 406-415.
- Porter, B. W., and Salazar, N. B., 2005. Heritage tourism, conflict, and public interest: An introduction. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(5), 361-370.
- Provan, K.G., Nakama, L., Veazie, M.A., Teufel-Shone, N.I. and Huddleston, C., 2003. Building community capacity around chronic disease services through a collaborative interorganizational network.

- Health Education & Behaviour*, 30(6), pp.646-662.
- Raj, R. and Musgrave, J. eds., 2009. *Event management and sustainability*. Cabi.
- Raj, R. and Griffin, K.A. eds., 2015. *Religious tourism and pilgrimage management: An international perspective*. Cabi.
- Raj, R., Walters, P., and Rashid, T., 2017. *Events management: principles and practice*. Sage.
- Reid, S., 2011. Event stakeholder management: developing sustainable rural event practices. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 2(1), 20-36.
- Selin, S., 1999. Developing a Typology of Sustainable Tourism Partnerships: *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 7:260-273.
- Schuster, J. M., 2001. Ephemera, temporary urbanism and imaging. Imaging the city: Continuing struggles and new directions. In Lawrence J. Vale and Sam Bass Warner Jr. (Eds.), *Imaging the City Continuing Struggles and New Directions*, 361-397. New Brunswick, New Jersey: CUPR Books.
- Sheehan, L.R. and Ritchie, J.B., 2005. Destination stakeholders exploring identity and salience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), pp.711-734.
- Stokes, R., 2008. Tourism strategy making: Insights into the events tourism domain. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 252-262.
- Su, M. M., and Wall, G., 2011. Chinese research on world heritage tourism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(1), 75-88.
- Tiew, F., Holmes, K., and De Bussy, N., 2015. Tourism events and the nature of stakeholder power. *Event Management*, 19(4), 525-541.
- Tkaczynski, A., 2013. A stakeholder approach to attendee segmentation: a case study of an Australian Christian music festival. *Event Management*, 17(3), 283-298.
- TNN. (2014). New Platforms near Viceroy's arch raised. *The Times of India*. October 7
- Todd, L., Leask, A., and Ensor, J., 2017. Understanding primary stakeholders' multiple roles in hallmark event tourism management. *Tourism Management*, 59, 494-509.
- Tosan, P., 2000. Limits to community participation in the Tourism Development Process in Developing Countries. *Tourism Management* 21: 613-633
- Tucker, H., and Emge, A., 2010. Managing a world heritage site: The case of Cappadocia. *Anatolia*, 21(1), 41-54.
- Venkataraman, S., 2002. Stakeholder value equilibration and the entrepreneurial process. *The Ruffin Series of the Society for Business Ethics*, 3, 45-57.
- Wasserman, S. and Faust, K., 1994. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications* (Vol. 8). Cambridge university press.
- Xue, H., & Mason, D. S., 2011. The changing stakeholder map of formula one grand prix in Shanghai. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(4), 371-395.
- Yaghmour, S., and Scott, N., 2009. Inter-organisational collaboration characteristics and outcomes: a case study of the Jeddah Festival. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 1(2), 115-130.
- Yasarata, M., Altinay, L., Burns, P., & Okumus, F. (2010). Politics and sustainable tourism development Can they co-exist? Voices from North Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 31(3), 345-356.
- Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B., and Yuksel, A., 1999. Stakeholder Interviews and Tourism Planning at Pamukkale, Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 20(3): 351-360.
- Zhang, C., Fyall, A., and Zheng, Y., 2015. Heritage and tourism conflict within world heritage sites in China: A longitudinal study. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(2), 110-136.
- Ziakas, V., 2013. *Event portfolio planning and management: A holistic approach*. Routledge.

About the author

Surabhi Anup Gore is an Assistant Professor at Rosary College of Commerce and Arts, Goa in the department of BBA Travel and Tourism since 2012. A hospitality graduate from IHM Calcutta, along with a Masters of Tourism Management (MTM), Masters of Business Administration (MBA) from IGNOU, New Delhi and an MPhil degree in Management Studies from Goa University, she is now pursuing a PhD in Management Studies from Goa University. She has total work experience of 14 years, of which ten years are in teaching and four years in the industry. She has contributed a couple of research papers in national and peer-reviewed journals. surabhogore@rediffmail.com

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr Purva Hegde Desai, Department of Management Studies, Goa University for guiding me during my MPhil dissertation. I would also like to extend my gratitude to all the stakeholders of tourism in Goa who shared useful and valuable information with me during my fieldwork. The feedback given by the reviewers and editor in chief of this journal has greatly helped me in writing this article. I extend my deepest gratitude to them.